

JPRS 78233

4 June 1981

East Europe Report

POLITICAL, SOCIOLOGICAL AND MILITARY AFFAIRS

No. 1885

FBIS **FOREIGN BROADCAST INFORMATION SERVICE**

NOTE

JPRS publications contain information primarily from foreign newspapers, periodicals and books, but also from news agency transmissions and broadcasts. Materials from foreign-language sources are translated; those from English-language sources are transcribed or reprinted, with the original phrasing and other characteristics retained.

Headlines, editorial reports, and material enclosed in brackets [] are supplied by JPRS. Processing indicators such as [Text] or [Excerpt] in the first line of each item, or following the last line of a brief, indicate how the original information was processed. Where no processing indicator is given, the information was summarized or extracted.

Unfamiliar names rendered phonetically or transliterated are enclosed in parentheses. Words or names preceded by a question mark and enclosed in parentheses were not clear in the original but have been supplied as appropriate in context. Other unattributed parenthetical notes within the body of an item originate with the source. Times within items are as given by source.

The contents of this publication in no way represent the policies, views or attitudes of the U.S. Government.

PROCUREMENT OF PUBLICATIONS

JPRS publications may be ordered from the National Technical Information Service, Springfield, Virginia 22161. In ordering, it is recommended that the JPRS number, title, date and author, if applicable, of publication be cited.

Current JPRS publications are announced in Government Reports Announcements issued semi-monthly by the National Technical Information Service, and are listed in the Monthly Catalog of U.S. Government Publications issued by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402.

Indexes to this report (by keyword, author, personal names, title and series) are available from Bell & Howell, Old Mansfield Road, Wooster, Ohio 44691.

Correspondence pertaining to matters other than procurement may be addressed to Joint Publications Research Service, 1000 North Glebe Road, Arlington, Virginia 22201.

4 June 1981

EAST EUROPE REPORT
POLITICAL, SOCIOLOGICAL AND MILITARY AFFAIRS

No. 1885

CONTENTS

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

- Warsaw Pact Cooperation in Civil Defense Described
(Miklos Molnar; POLGARI VEDELEM, Jan 81) 1

CZECHOSLOVAKIA

- TRIBUNA Publishes Explicit Attacks on Solidarity
(Karel Horak; TRIBUNA, 22 Apr 81) 7

GERMAN DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC

- FRG Commentary on GDR Dissident Havemann's New Book
(Hans Herbert Goetz; FRANKFURTER ALLGEMEINE, 7 Feb 81) 11

HUNGARY

- The End of Stability
(Zoltan Zsille, Anna Balajthy Interview; MAGYAR FUZETEK, No 8,
1981) 14

POLAND

- Draft Law on Agricultural Self-Government Formulated
(TRYBUNA LUDU, 23 Mar 81) 27

ROMANIA

- Wisdom of Solution of Minority Problem Hailed
(Elena Florea; CONTEMPORANUL, 29 Apr 81) 43
- Quality, Efficiency of Labor Force Discussed
(Ion Pacararu; ERA SOCIALISTA, 5 Mar 81) 46

Deficiencies of Literary Criticism Analyzed	
(Ion Dodu Balan; ERA SOCIALISTA, 5 Mar 81)	53
Current Literary Scene Reviewed by Writer	
(Mihai Ungeanu Interview; FLACARA, 26 Mar 81)	59

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

WARSAW PACT COOPERATION IN CIVIL DEFENSE DESCRIBED

Budapest POLGARI VEDELEM in Hungarian No 1, Jan 81 pp 4-5

[Article by Lt Col Miklos Molnar: "On Hungary's International Cooperation"]

[Text] At the end of the Fifth Five-Year Plan, we are preparing in every area of our lives to make an accounting of the results achieved. Civil defense, which is celebrating its 30th anniversary, is also analyzing the realization of its established goals and plans and is planning for the tasks of the coming planning cycle. In addition to the tasks fulfilled in the past 5 years--without claiming to be complete, but by way of orientation--it is appropriate to survey the development of international contacts in civil defense, from its beginning to the present.

Reflecting on the international contacts in civil defense that have been formed with regard to their characteristics and content we can distinguish three basic periods of development.

The first period lasted from the 1950's to 1965, when the civil-defense leaders of the socialist countries conferred in Moscow.

The second period extended to 7-8 January 1975, when Warsaw Pact Defense Ministers' Committee held its 7th session in Moscow.

The third period comprises the time since then.

I.

During the first period of development, as in every area of life, bilateral cooperation in regard to civil defense--then still anti-aircraft defense--developed first with the Soviet Union. The Soviet Union gave already in the early 1950's all kinds of technical assistance for the organization and development of Hungarian anti-aircraft defense, and provided the possibility for anti-aircraft defense officers to participate in theoretical and practical training in the Soviet Union. We have been making use of this opportunity ever since.

Civil-defense leaders are systematically studying and creatively applying the experiences of civil defense in the Soviet Union, particularly the principles

of population defense, and the system of functional leadership, the principles, the forms and the methods of operation of civil defense. Through systematic consultations, they are receiving new information and useful experiences about many subjects to accomplish current and future tasks.

Thus during the first 15 years of civil defense--the first period of international cooperation--it was basically with civil defense in the Soviet Union that fruitful bilateral cooperation developed.

II.

The year 1965 must be regarded as a highly significant milestone in the development of international cooperation. This is because in December 1965 the civil-defense leaders of the socialist countries at their Moscow conference formulated a joint standpoint by which individual socialist countries would create or modify their anti-aircraft or civil defense on basically the same principles, but taking into account local characteristics. They also agreed that when characteristics of national areas and organizations are taken into account, the tasks and unsolved problems of civil defense also appear in similar ways in individual socialist countries.

From what was said during the conference, it became quite clear that the participants became acquainted with such experience in the areas of construction, development and modernization of civil defense that a frequent mutual exchange [of such experiences] would be advantageous and desirable for all concerned for the successful and harmonious resolution of future tasks.

The participants in the conference came to the conclusion that establishment of a closer contact and cooperation among the civil defense organizations of the socialist countries was appropriate and necessary, taking into account national characteristics, relationships and possibilities. The conference recommended that cooperation be extended to multilateral joint technical consultations, sharing of training methods, coordination of scientific research and to other areas of civil-defense work as well.

Thus the 1965 Moscow conference represented the starting point from which planned and organized bilateral and multilateral international cooperation in many areas of civil defense began.

Following the conference, still in 1965, contact between Hungarian and Polish civil defense came about. On the basis of what was said at the conference, we looked for those areas where cooperation between us would be mutually advantageous. The Hungarian People's Republic and the Polish People's Republic do not share a common border, so there was no realistic basis for such kinds of practical cooperation as coordination of the tasks of civil defense along common borders, war-time cooperation, evacuation, accommodations, rescue, assistance, etc. Thus our cooperation takes the form of technical consultations, exchange of experiences and exchange of developmental results. The consultations are concerned primarily with questions of organization of

population defense and technical development of defense institutions. Considering the realistic possibilities, our contacts will still be directed toward coordinating scientific research, mutual exchange of experiences, and giving and receiving [information about] proven and adopted methods.

Because of geographical characteristics, we have established similar contacts with the civil-defense body of the Bulgarian People's Republic. This relationship, in regard to its content, is mainly at the level of the leadership and has taken the form of consultations on questions in the area of operations. The subject area of the consultations has spread to questions of central and local military leadership, systems for alarm and notification of the population, and problems of organization, training and utilization of specialized units.

Contacts with the civil defense body of the Romanian Socialist Republic began in July 1966. The Romanian civil defense leaders recommended establishment and study of civil-defense contacts between counties along the border. We accepted the initiative gladly, since it agreed with the principles adopted at the Moscow conference, and the section of common border offered opportunities for practical realization of cooperation along a border. The first substantive discussions took place in Budapest, at which time we briefed the Romanian delegation with the situation of Hungarian civil defense, results achieved, and questions of organization and training. Following this, a civil-defense delegation at the leadership level was invited to Bucharest, where the Hungarian delegation obtained useful experience about the situation of Romanian civil defense, the organizational structure and basic tasks of the Romanian civil-defense forces, the system of material and technical supply, the training of civil-defense organizations, the country's alarm system, the principles of evacuation and relocation, as well as certain results and the directions for development of scientific research.

Closer contact with the civil defense body of the GDR was introduced at a consultation held in July 1968 in Budapest, where we discussed experiences in the planning and organization of civil defense and the questions of war-time direction. On the agenda were problems concerning the defense of the population as well as the role of the press and propaganda in training. We decided on the long-range tasks for cooperation, and compiled a plan for cooperation which was signed by the civil-defense leaders of the two countries.

The accomplishment of the tasks established in the plan for cooperation provided useful experiences for the civil-defense organizations of both countries.

The civil defense organizations of the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic and our country have worked out a plan for cooperation, the significance of which is indicated by the fact that in addition to peace-time tasks, it also defined mutual assistance and cooperation during wartime.

To practice the tasks of cooperation along a border, we held exercises with joint command and leadership in October 1970, in which--according to the plan previously worked out--the civil-defense body of Borsod-Abaúj-Zemplén County

practiced the organization and direction of the tasks defined in the plans. On the basis of the experiences of the exercises--to evaluate the results achieved and the problems remaining, we conducted even larger joint exercises, which were observed by a high-level committee of party, state and military personnel.

Direct civil-defense cooperation with our southern neighbor, Yugoslavia, has not been established. But they have made it possible for us to study questions of civil defense arising from the Skopje earthquake by inviting a Hungarian civil-defense delegation.

From the above brief listing of events, it appears that during the first and second periods of international civil-defense cooperation conditions were established that served as the basis for qualitative changes in relationships and for raising cooperation to a higher level.

III.

We regard the third period of international cooperation as beginning with the 1975 session of the Warsaw Pact Defense Ministers' Committee. In our judgment, a change in our relationships took place after this time.

During the session, the commander of civil defense in the Soviet Union and general of the army, A. T. Altyunin emphasized in his report that the contacts established among the countries belonging to the Warsaw Pact were essential elements for further increasing defense capability. He stressed that civil-defense contacts among Warsaw Pact member states must be broadened and made permanent. Organization of systematic and mutual orientation to resolve the most important questions that have arisen in coordination of efforts will make it possible for us to utilize more economically the available experiences and resources for the defense of civil-defense forces, the population, food, water and livestock. He emphasized that the most important forms of cooperation for civil-defense commanders of the socialist countries are information exchange and scientific-technical conferences.

Beginning with the 1975 conference, our relationships with our allied countries have become more systematic and they have improved in quality and deepened in content. New, useful and effective forms of multilateral contact have evolved.

Today we can already say that the principles of the 1975 Moscow conference directed toward further expansion and development of bilateral and multilateral relationships have been realized in accordance with the goals set.

The programs achieved on the basis of the plans for work and events that were formulated have served well as a basis for the development of civil defense.

The first such event was in August 1975 in the Soviet Union, with the participation of the civil-defense commanders of our allied countries. At this conference, the participants received orientation about the situation and the main directions and principles for development of civil defense in the Soviet Union.

Through a display exercise arranged with military and civilian civil-defense forces within the framework of this event, the participants received a broad overview of preparations for defense of the population and material goods, and about modern principles and methods of rescue and relief.

Within the framework of the series of events, the civil-defense leaders of the Warsaw Pact member states and other socialist countries observed civil-defense leadership and tactical exercises in April 1976 in the Bulgarian People's Republic. The exercise was very instructive in regard to planning, organization and methods applied. It called attention to many new principles and practical solutions, for example the role of classification of civil-defense forces and the system for directing them.

The international consultation and display exercise organized in the Polish People's Republic in November 1976 served well to broaden cooperation. The display of the utilization of civil-defense units directed attention to the significance and necessity of cooperation between civil-defense units and other organizations. It was demonstrated in practice that the specialized civil-defense units are capable of cooperation in broad areas.

In May 1977 in the German Democratic Republic an international civil-defense event took place that offered useful experience for the training of civil-defense cadres. The participants obtained information about organization and equipping of county civil-defense schools and other instructional institutions.

In November 1977 a series of events was organized in our country on the subject of radiological, biological and chemical defense of material goods. In the opinion of the leaders of the Warsaw Pact member states, this event also promoted manysided cooperation and gave useful experience for planning, organization and practical realization of radiological, biological and chemical defense.

Analysis and evaluation of civil-defense cooperation was an independent item on the agenda of the 1977 Budapest meeting of the Warsaw Pact Defense Ministers' Committee.

During the meeting of the Defense Ministers' Committee, our defense minister emphasized in his speech that the organization and continuing development of our civil defense has always been accomplished within the framework of cooperation with fraternal socialist countries and has been accompanied by utilization of joint results. Since its beginning, Hungarian civil defense--in every period of its development--has been able to count on support and assistance from the socialist countries.

In accordance with the resolution of the Defense Ministers' Committee, an international civil-defense display entitled "Hansag-Dunaj 78" was organized in March 1978 in connection with the accomplishment of exercises for commanders and leadership, which involved the civil-defense commanders of our country and the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic and also included the civil-defense commanders of districts and counties along the border. In the course of the exercises--the first such among Warsaw Pact member states--we carried out in practice all the joint tasks that are incumbent on us in consequence of the plan for cooperation.

As part of the organization of civil defense in the Soviet Union, an exercise connected with a display for commanders and leadership took place in 1979, in which national civil-defense bodies and border civil-defense organizations participated from the Soviet Union, Poland, Czechoslovakia and Hungary.

The region covered by the exercise included a significant portion of the western and southwestern part of the area of the Warsaw Pact member states. The length of the national borders of the countries participating in the exercise is some 900 kilometers.

In these republics live 110 million people, of which 15 million are located directly in the area covered by the exercise. A significant portion of the fraternal countries' industry and several large economic centers and railroad junctions are centered here. An exceptionally important number of transportation and energy lines pass through the area of the border counties. All this makes close cooperation between the fraternal countries necessary, so that we can provide the population of this region with reliable defense as well as help in recovering from the results of an enemy attack.

In addition to international cooperation in civil defense and bilateral and multilateral exercises, consultations and meetings at the leadership level have become regular. In June of this year in Prague, and in October in Moscow the civil-defense leaders of the Warsaw Pact states held discussions on questions of defense of the national economies.

Besides the leadership discussions, we are continuing regular consultations with the commanding officers of civil defense of the Soviet Union, the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic, the Polish People's Republic, the Bulgarian People's Republic and the German Democratic Republic on various questions of mutual interest.

In summary we can say that the cooperation in civil defense that has been established and is continuing to develop among the Warsaw Pact member states is generally contributing to the successful accomplishment of our common tasks and fulfillment of our international obligations.

9611

CSO: 2500/197

TRIBUNA PUBLISHES EXPLICIT ATTACKS ON SOLIDARITY

Prague TRIBUNA in Czech No 16, 22 Apr 81 pp 8, 9

[Article by Karel Horak: "'Independent' Unions--Instrument of Counterrevolution"]

[Text] Recent developments in the Polish People's Republic have convincingly demonstrated once again that the socialist attainments of the Polish working people are seriously threatened, that antisocialist forces in this fraternal country, acting under a previously-elaborated scenario, are resolutely striving for the liquidation of the socialist system.

Since the rise of the so-called independent unions, it has been clear that the initiators behind their emergence were antisocialist forces whose principal objective is a metamorphosis into an opposition political party which, at a propitious moment, would seize power by peaceful means and carry out counterrevolutionary changes. Through clever concealment of the real aims, advocacy--with a good dose of demagoguery--of certain justified workers demands, spreading of nationalism, and misusing religious feelings of citizens, these forces have succeeded in deceiving and luring into their ranks a large segment of the working class, and in carrying out their hostile activities in its name. The facts, however, clearly show that behind the "workers" demands and interests propagated by Solidarity, there lurks the intention of discrediting socialism, placing in jeopardy the leading role of the PZPR, disrupting the economy, strengthening the influence of the church, and creating an atmosphere of tension, anarchy, and chaos.

As noted by Stanislaw Kania at the eighth session of the PZPR Central Committee, Solidarity has been taken over by people whose program is anarchy, counterrevolution, and liquidation of socialism. How far Solidarity's activity, which reached one of its peaks in January, can lead was openly stated in the West German DIE WELT of 3 February 1981 when it wrote: "Recent weeks have been witnessing a virtual dismantling of communist state power...the process of erosion in Poland is assuming momentous proportions in every respect."

Aim to Deepen Crisis

Following the eighth session of the PZPR Central Committee (of 9 February 1981) when the government of Wojciech Jaruzelski proclaimed a 90-day strike moratorium, all that had been clear from the very beginning emerged in all its stark reality.

The "independent" unions, in fact, rejected a halt in strikes by conditioning it on the fulfillment of their demands. This was openly admitted by Solidarity's deputy chairman, Bogdan Lis, during his visit with the Swedish Trade Unions: "Solidarity will refrain from future strikes only provided the government accelerates the resolution of urgent problems...Only if the government responds favorably to the union can it expect that we will cooperate." This position was nothing but gross coercion to force the government into a new retreat from socialist positions.

Such demands of the "independent" unions indeed lie neither in the economic nor social area but rather in the political sphere. They include a broader independence of the courts from state power, restraints on the work of State Security, access to information media, reform of censorship, release of "political" prisoners, registration of private farmers unions, and full pay to the workers for the days they were on strike. In exchange for a chimeric period of calm (i.e., without strikes), Solidarity was to be accorded more legal elbowroom for its activity, for influencing the workers, and especially for undermining socialism with impunity.

We have sufficient experience from the crisis years in Czechoslovakia to know what, in the terminology of the antisocialist forces, is meant by "independence" of the courts and restraints on the work of State Security. It simply means a free hand for machinations by enemies of socialism, for capitalist intelligence services and other anticommunist organizations.

As unfolding events have demonstrated, however, the "independent" unions were not concerned with resumption of work in the factories, an essential precondition for at least partial improvement of the economic situation and supply process for the population, so that the country might begin implementing the government's 10-point program. It was clearly demonstrated once again that the slogans about defending workers interests, with which they so often operate, are only a false front with which the workers are to be deceived into cooperation. The aim of Solidarity's demands was the achievement of political concessions directed against socialism, the deepening of social disruption, hindering state and party bodies in carrying out their normal duties, and whipping up an atmosphere in which anyone who disagrees and refuses to support Solidarity is branded an enemy of Poland and its people.

Following the government proclamation on the strike moratorium (12 February 1981), the "independent" unions reverted to their prepared scenario and began organizing a permanent campaign for strikes and unrest. No sooner had one strike been "extinguished" by the adopted agreements than another was "burning" in another location, usually even more extensive than the one before and carrying with it demands to be met immediately. Not a single day passed without Solidarity probing major and minor conflicts involving threats, without some strike somewhere on the broad horizon. These were purposefully organized provocations against the government, the PZPR and their officials. Antisocialist forces were probing to see how far they could go after the eighth PZPR Central Committee session, how the government would react, while, at the same time, demonstrating their capability to paralyze life in the country.

Aim Is Liquidation of Socialism

Solidarity and the antisocialist forces have entered into an open political struggle, the struggle for power. The entire country was flooded with printed matter, leaflets and posters, with hostile, antisocialist content. In many of these, there was the demand that PZPR members in Solidarity must decide which set of statutes is binding for them--Solidarity's or the party's. Many of the leaflets carried pictures of the gallows, there were open calls for violence, murders and bloodshed, communists were threatened, the party attacked and discredited.

There was enormous ideological pressure which was to create within the party and among citizens the impression that the past 36 years of socialist construction were nothing but a collection of mistakes, shortcomings and illegalities, that everything the party had done was bad and served only a handful of officials, rather than the people. Attacks on party and state representatives intensified, party members were subjected to psychological pressures, with the aim of weakening their loyalty to the party, undermining their confidence in socialism and its values, and thus totally paralyzing the action capability of party ranks.

Also serving toward this end are past and present calls for retribution for the suppression of the activities of antisocialist forces in 1956, 1970, and 1976, demands for the rehabilitation of those who had organized such antisocialist actions of those years, and punishment of the "guilty," i.e., those who had struggled against these antisocialist phenomena. A number of Solidarity organizations even demanded that monuments be erected to the participants of the anti-socialist initiatives, that these events be investigated again, and that severe measures be taken against those who had frustrated these hostile endeavors. Demands for punishment of those who in March 1968 fought against the activities of the antisocialist forces at Warsaw universities were also heard at an assembly which on 8 March 1981, on the 13th anniversary of these "events," was organized by the so-called Independent Student Union and Solidarity at Warsaw University. The justified punishment of proponents of antisocialist and Zionist forces who had organized the student protest in March 1968, was branded a symbol of brutal persecution of freedom of thought and destruction of national culture. At the student assembly, as well as at a subsequent "scientific seminar," Solidarity's representative, A. Walentynowiczowa, as well as the principal proponent of the antisocialist forces, J. Kuron, grossly attacked the Polish party and state leadership, socialism, and Poland's friendship with the Soviet Union.

The purpose of these campaigns--as was the case in Czechoslovakia in 1968-69, is nothing but an attempt to present historical events in a distorted sense, to literally turn history "upside down." It is a matter of providing the leaders of the antisocialist forces with satisfaction for past attacks on socialism, of bedecking them with an aura of heroes, and thus make them more credible in the future. On the other hand, all those who had participated in the containment of the antisocialist elements are presented as enemies of the nation and its people.

How could it be otherwise? For, indeed, those who stood behind the antisocialist demonstrations of March 1968 were--as noted on 9 March 1981 in ZOLNIERZ WOLNOSCI--people like Kolakowski and Brus who today are advising the antisocialist forces

from abroad, while the tone of the student demonstrations of March 1968 had been set by Michnik and Modzelewski who represent the antisocialist forces in Poland.

Protection of Antisocialist Forces

An important role in Solidarity campaigns was played by attacks against the security organs and their members. It was demanded that they be recalled from their positions and punished for doing their duty against the undermining of socialism in years past. Every action of the security services against certain Solidarity members for breaking valid Polish laws (e.g., occupation of state premises, possession of illegal printed matter), was magnified, given a different interpretation, and presented as harassment, restricting freedom, and an attack on Solidarity as a whole. According to UPI, Solidarity on 25 February 1981 established a special commission which is to investigate abuses of power by Polish security services. The aim is again the same, i.e., to discredit the security organs in the eyes of the people, cause a feeling of uncertainty among its ranks, and to cripple their activity as much as possible, thus making impossible any security moves against the antisocialist forces.

Along with an intensification of hate-filled attacks on party organs and officials, as well as on all those who are defending socialist principles, Solidarity has placed under its protective wing the proponents of the antisocialist forces, including members of the so-called Confederation for Independent Poland, against whom court proceedings have been instituted for antistate activity, disruption of Polish alliances, and cooperation with capitalist intelligence services. Following the prosecutor's charges against Kuron and Michnik of slandering and ridiculing the Polish nation and the socialist system, Solidarity announced that it would not permit any harassment of KOR members. By its standards, therefore, nobody can be prosecuted--this would be considered repression for political beliefs. Consequently, according to Solidarity, the defense of socialism and the struggle against subversion of the socialist system, is a breach of legality. Turning reality upside down is, after all, typical for every type of counterrevolution. In our country too in 1968, those who defended socialism were branded obsolete conservatives and enemies of the republic and its people, while CIA agents, counterrevolutionaries and revisionists became saviors of the nation.

9496

CSO: 2400/175

FRG COMMENTARY ON GDR DISSIDENT HAVEMANN'S NEW BOOK

Frankfurt/Main FRANKFURTER ALLGEMEINE in German 7 Feb 81 p 12

[Article by Hans Herbert Goetz, datelined Berlin, 6 February: "'Real Socialism Is No Socialism'--Robert Havemann's Trip to 'Utopia'"]

[Text] Political utopias are as old as man's ability to ponder his existence. One has been able to read about them since Plato and particularly since Thomas Morus, who in 1516 invented the nonexistent country, the island of Utopia, which was said to be ruled by reason. Those partly eerie, partly airy models came into being in batches from time to time. Our time, for its part, is characterized by such a batch of utopias, dissimilar though their types may be, ranging from Aldous Huxley's "Brave New World" (1932) to Ernst Juenger's "Heliopolis" (1949) or Hermann Hesse's "Glasperlenspiel" to George Orwell's "1984" (1950). Now, in the past few years, a new type of utopia has emerged against the apocalyptic but increasingly real background of the progressive destruction of the environment and the realization that the resources of the crust of the earth are "final" in the literal sense of the word. This type of utopia is based on the fact that the Western, and lately also the Eastern, industrialized countries no longer, as in the past, will be able to continue their economic policy ad infinitum. Of a sudden, the magic word "growth" is appearing in a pale light. The sponsors have been the reports of the Club of Rome, particularly the second one. Herbert Gruhl and Erhard Eppler are among those who have issued this warning.

On the Eastern side, Wolfgang Harich in 1975 was the first to pose the provocative question, "Communism or growth?" In doing so he outlined the model of a radical rationing economy as the only way out--a "horrible" one, as he himself admitted. Now Robert Havemann, with his book "Morgen: die Industriegesellschaft am Scheideweg, Kritik und reale Utopie" [Tomorrow: Industrialized Society at a Crossroads, Criticism and Real Utopia], published by Piper, shows that even after the grotesque surveillance--bad for him and disgraceful as far as the GDR is concerned--his thinking has remained rebellious.

The construction is clear. First there are the "proofs" that neither capitalism nor really existing socialism in their traditional variants will be in a position to solve the production and distribution problems approaching mankind, and especially industrialized countries, with breakneck speed. In the end there is the attempt by a Marxist, convinced as ever of the possibility of "socialist democracy" (albeit

one that still needs to be developed), to describe the elements of a new Marxism conceived neither by the politbureaucracy nor by leftist particularists. In between, touching in part, there is the 100-page report of a trip by the Havemann family to "Utopia," to the country of our hopes," established in Yugoslavia. There is no money any longer, all existing taboos and rules of morality have been suspended and the military and automobile and air transport have been abolished. Apart from emergencies, when the helicopter performs needed services, the donkey is the most important means of transport. Under such "preconditions" the problems of raw material and energy supply understandably turn out to have been "solved" from the start.

If this partly amusing description of Utopia belongs among entertaining leisure reading, other portions of the book are of a harder quality. "Capitalism" probably is not taken too seriously by Havemann because he thinks Marx has said all that there is to say about it and, in the view of solid Marxists, time has run out on capitalism as it is. Like patriarch Marx before him, the author goes so far as to concede certain merits to "capitalism"--particularly the partly quite beneficial consequences of that "most vehement unleashing of productive forces." These, even Havemann thinks, if only they were utilized properly, could enable the entire population of the earth to live a life without need and misery. "The cruelty and violence, the injustice and lust for power" inherent in the system, in his opinion, render it incapable of mastering the pending crisis of existence of mankind.

What Havemann has to say quite universally about the failure of "real socialism," particularly in the economic sphere, might be contained in any Western textbook presenting a comparison of systems. "Real socialism is not socialism," he says, "and its planned economy is not a planned economy." Even a supercomputer which probably will never exist, will not be able to solve the valuation problems, he adds. In competing with capitalism, real socialism will "only try to reproduce all the economic absurdities, without being able to utilize a single advantage of that competitive system. Its historic mission--namely, to demonstrate to all the world that socialism differs fundamentally from capitalism not only politically but also as regards its economic aims--it will abysmally fail to accomplish."

Somber prospects, then, for East and West. But in what direction should Western and Eastern industrialized societies move to avoid the catastrophe which, in the final analysis, can only end in wars, Havemann asks, considering that the situation is one "in which bourgeois society is still capitalistic but hardly democratic any longer, and real socialism is no longer capitalistic but not yet socialist and not yet democratic"? In the communist countries, he says, contrary to what Bahro has proposed, the situation cannot be changed by a new "league of communists." Rather the fight can be waged only within the party, because "the comrades and officials of the SED, including the comrades in the Politburo, are not enemies and adversaries who must be fought tooth and nail." The most important thing is a "vast expansion of the debate about democracy and socialism," wherever that is possible--in plants, schools and universities--without "ever violating legality. The freedom of public debate, discussion, criticism, codetermination and to strike must be fought for and achieved step by step." Havemann recommends referring back to texts of Rosa Luxemburg, who in his opinion considered "dictatorship of the proletariat" and "socialist democracy" to be one and the same. The chances are that Havemann,

who did not yet draw on the Polish developments in his book, knows himself that such hopes in turn have to be relegated to the realm of utopia in the GDR.

And what about the West? Here, according to Havemann, the Marxist methods continue to be serviceable. According to Marx, the revolution fully attains its required strength only when, owing to the worsening class contradictions, the existing production relationships become the crucial obstacle in the way of the further development of the forces of production. "Such a situation could not yet be said to exist by the sixties and early seventies of this century in any country of the world, let alone in prerevolutionary Russia. Only in the late seventies and now in the early eighties, there has been developing the kind of structural crisis of capitalism which has the characteristic features postulated by Marx for revolution to come to fruition." In other words, only now has the time come at last for the Marxian theory about change to take effect. Havemann does realize that Marxist theoreticians have often thought that this "change" was at hand, but he says so far they have all been mistaken.

The mechanism of change does not take its course entirely automatically, however, because the new revolution "can triumph only if it is set in motion by the united force of the broad masses who have realized that it means salvation for them from acute danger." If Rudolf Bahro seeks new allies for the revolutionary change among the Alternatives, the women, the intellectuals, Havemann sets his sights on plants and trade unions as the revolutionary potential. He primarily takes to task the unions which in "thinking ahead to the objective" (reorganization of the division of labor, shaping of the labor process in line with human requirements), and in general in the sphere of "creative Marxism," so far have not come up with the needed answers. Like Bahro, Havemann knows that communism so far has not succeeded in winning over the workers in the West for its ideas. The new frontlines of the struggle, therefore, should be in the plants and also in the public forums, in the institutes of the associations, in the arts, in literature, in the theater. And finally Havemann's economic and ecological ideas come around to what one might have expected hereabouts—a shortening of the workweek down to 20 hours as the only possibility of reducing and finally eliminating unemployment and utilization of leisure time, entirely in the spirit of "Utopia."

At this point, reading the book becomes especially irritating. The "do-nothing society" propounded by Havemann and promoted by the unions cannot solve the problems of this century. If one manages—if one were to manage—in the system of the market economy to give the right signals to enterprises and consumers, to maintain competition and get a grip on inflation, the waste of raw materials and other ills would be halted. This is possible provided that we keep a clear head. Utopias generally make for entertaining reading, but Havemann's book does show that the economy turns out to be unsuitable for utopias. That field is a rocky one.

B790

CSO: 2300/221

THE END OF STABILITY

Paris MAGYAR FUZETEK in Hungarian No 8, 1981 pp 45-62

[An interview in Vienna with Zoltan Zsille and Anna Balajthy; appeared in issue No 3 (January-March 1981) of the Austrian journal GEGENSTIMMEN]

[Text] [Question] Profound social processes have begun in Poland. What is your opinion about these?

[Answer] Zsille: Let me start at some distance. In totalitarian, one-party systems striving for state omnipotence in every area of life important differences in political view are already expressed in the definition of the concept of opposition itself. These systems regard themselves as culminations of historical development in which society is becoming perfect within itself in such a way that the planning center, the politburo of the party, criticizes itself and is its own "opposition." In this way they have played out a hundred times that nauseating game in which the same dictator or the same political committee announces a new line every few years, and carries it out with the same apparatus. The functionary whom they ordered to do the opposite yesterday will today be the enthusiastic executor of the new command or will be condemned as an enemy for his faithfulness or obedience of yesterday. Thus in principle even within the party there can be a counter-opinion only as a private person. If it is this way within the party it is even more so in the case of a simple citizen. A member of the opposition in the original sense of the word, that is, one who follows other social ideals, who imagines a different political system or a different economic structure or at the least demands an exchange of accouterments, is called an enemy in the "existing socialist" systems.

In Hungary even some of the opposition consider this legalistic judgment of differences in view or political debate justified. They protest against the title "opposition" and call themselves internal critics and try to get themselves accepted in the eyes of the power as believers in some sort of "true socialism," in a theological sense, or as researchers of a no less obscure "all-social interest," as "constructive" critics who stand outside but are for that reason reliable, well-meaning and harmless. This behavior has two negative results: in the first place they completely lose the trust and good-will of the men of the regime; while those disgusted by the regime do not understand what they are actually criticizing and in what respect they oppose the political line of the Kadarists.

Tragic experiences and a very just fear of new catastrophes or sacrifices of blood make it possible to understand this position and role which, for tactical reasons, is also followed by the other large group of the opposition in their public role. They do not question the system in basic questions; in connection with these they talk only of reforms, or they do not speak about them at all.

Whether this involves religious trembling or a protection of incognito--I understand them: these are variations of the Bolshevik world picture and style of political behavior. I understand, because for a brief time I also was a prisoner of Bolshevik thought and action. I no longer accept either. Tactics is a question of detail: one can argue about what is good when, but in a police state with a human mask, like Hungary, it is largely a matter of luck. The essential difference between the legalistic opposition and those on the black list, like myself, is not in our tactics but rather in the fact that we are striving for a fundamental change of the system. From that and only from that do we expect a solution of the fundamental social problems, economic prosperity, democracy, a legal system which aspires to justice, life worthy of a man and the solidarity and community of men governing themselves with an independent state.

Let us not confuse goals and means. We should understand if someone does not want or does not dare to utter the word revolution in East Europe. Especially in Hungary, where up to now the only revolution broke out in the Soviet camp and where it was bloodily suppressed with extraordinary brutality. Our political action must be guided by wisdom and humanism and must be aided by the immensely rich fighting methods of national, civil and popular resistance. But my goals, those of my friends and the goal of many Hungarians can be realized only if revolutionary changes take place. We should demand these, however meekly, however cleverly and in whatever style.

After this, let us look at the changes in Poland. Those who believe in the socialist system's capacity for reform can feel themselves justified with respect to the results achieved, the demands made and the direction of events as can those who, like myself, rule this out. I consider the changes, the achievements and especially the demands to be of a revolutionary character. We could also call them radical reforms; but the essence is that what is expressed in the signed agreements is a victory won with their own strength by a society and by citizens, oppressed by the party and state, and is a defeat of the party and state. But this is only on paper, which in the eyes of the communists has never meant anything, because the only thing they respect is power. So every day and everywhere they must fight anew for what has been achieved, to defend and implement agreements. But that which has been born in this way will be a different society, that is democracy, and means the fall of the totalitarian system, the despotism of the communist party. And this also means that the Soviet Union has lost its power over one of the significant provinces of its empire. I consider it obvious that as long as the Soviet Union does not collapse, or does not give up the eastern European countries in some fantastic new constellation, at some fantastic price, it will not let them go of its own free will. To presume that they would be a tragic naivete, like that of the Imre Nagy group who believed the promises in 1956 that they could freely return home from the Yugoslav embassy.

I am convinced that the Pole's too, know this very well. They have experienced that what they achieved was not a gift, but they had to fight for it. Those who greet the victory of the independent trade unions as proof of the reformability of the system still take the position that in essence society is identical with the state, the state with the party, and that the party is the chief depository of progress and democracy.

The truth is just the contrary. Society is that which is reformable, or capable of acting in a revolutionary manner, despite every repression of alien rule, the communist party and the police state.

[Question] You speak of the colonial character of the relationship of the Soviet Union and the eastern European countries. What does this mean?

[Answer] Zsille: One of our friends, who was sentenced to 5 years in prison for his activity in 1955 and who is now dead, formulated it this way, that every essential question concerning Budapest is decided in Moscow. Naturally they do not deal in the capital of the empire with such details as, for example, whom an ephemeral journalist can bark at in ELET ES IRODALOM. But what is really important militarily, politically and economically (the war economy)--where the road should lead, what role Hungary should play in the mediatory trade in western products which fall under a ban for the Soviet Union, or who should be premier. This is prescribed by the Soviet authorities, and it definitely cannot be debated. To strengthen the effectiveness of control and simplify execution, those sitting in key positions are those who receive good grades in Moscow (a significant number of them were trained there), who have good Soviet contacts (perhaps by marrying into a Soviet family); the classical Stalinist solution is for them to be high ranking officers of the Red Army or of the KGB, if they are Soviet citizens. Those who do not fit this mold can justly feel themselves to be in a threatened situation because either they attained their positions by chance, by oversight, or they were the tools of some sort of display policy, and if control becomes more strict or there is a change in [the policy] line they will be the first to be thrown out of their positions.

Let us take, for example, the case of Gyorgy Aczel. Even here and there in the West he is given status in productions financed from the East in order to indulge amateur ambitions or play the chief liberal. He who regards himself as a key to liberalism because he went as far as one can go--and he is not too popular in Moscow--really owes his position to the fact that he is always ready to deal himself with the "concomitant phenomena" of his pseudo-liberal cultural policy and, further, to the fact that he has gained sufficient experience in the cadre and social psychological problems of intellectual circles (fed on demagogy) so that he is more effective in diverting them than the "honest, sincere" dogmatists.

[Question] You just spoke of national and civil resistance. Can we speak of a worker opposition in Hungary?

[Answer] Zsille: The plebian-popular opposition is the most lively in Hungary. But practically speaking the joke is the only form of political expression for them. The Hungarians even joke about strikes:

"Why are there no strikes in Hungary?"

"Because no one would notice them."

Of course, even the reactionary collaborators like to tell this joke; like everything, they explain this also according to their taste: "We are poor, but we live well," "we work so that others can get on," etc. In other words, people live well in Hungary, but nobody works. In reality what is involved is that today everyone tries to manage his own manpower and see to it that he and his enjoy the fruits of his labor. There is an awful lot of work of an awful lot of people behind the tourist mirage of contemporary Hungary. The Hungarian worker works more than his colleague in western Europe, only not in one place and not in 8 hours. He could not live on that.

Balajthy: Perhaps the strike is not institutionalized so obviously as in Poland, one may not know who the leaders are, their demands are not always collected into points (although this happens too), for the most part they remain economic demands (although for the regime every counter-opinion takes on a political color and immediately endangers the entire superstructure), but it is a fact that there are constantly strikes in Hungary for economic demands; they simply put down their tools and do not work. Larger or smaller plants, parts of plants, factories, factory units. Of course, the leadership always tries to isolate these strikes as much as possible and come to an agreement as soon as possible, before news of the event spreads.

Zsille: In general they did come to an agreement, and the workers are getting what they asked for...

Balajthy: At least temporarily; later they will try to take it back from them quietly.

Zsille: We could give very many examples of strikes. Let us take one. An instrument factory would have liked to get a higher price for one of its products from the Soviets. The delegation was already up in Moscow to explain to the Russians: New, more expensive and better parts were being built into the apparatus, it was worth more. Of course, they should have shown a prototype in order to do this. But it was still in some provincial factory unit, half finished.

Balajthy: A typical example of socialist management is complete chaos....

Zsille: They called desperately from Moscow to send the apparatus, because it had to be on the table in two days. Pest called the factory unit, that it had to be ready by morning, then they would send it by plane. The answer: Sorry, no go, the parts were not sent in time, and the people commute from the villages, and cannot work overtime because they would miss the train. Telephone calls back and forth. Finally it turned out that it could be done somehow, but that it would cost money. The chiefs may have been wagering for a government decoration, and then the premium, 50,000 to 100,000 for the year. So they would have to pay for it. A typical strike situation: If you pay, we work; if you do not pay, we do not work. I rather imagine that here, as in very many cases, what was involved was not the work, but rather whether they would hand over the expensive apparatus

or not. Because probably it was already finished, only it was hidden. They handed it over, the plane could take it, and the workers got a thousand each, out of pocket, because you cannot put something like this in the books. The result of the strike: a week's pay in one day.

Of course, the chief method of struggle is moving on.

[Question] Didn't they want to ban this?

Balajthy: They are always trying. An example: Ede Horvath, the "red baron," the talked about at home and praised even in the West, has such influence in Győr-Sopron Megye and such a following within the megye party committee that he can convince Megye factory directors that: if anyone leaves the Rába-Plant he cannot get work anywhere in the megye, and maybe only 200 kilometers away. Thus maybe people would think twice about leaving. And maybe if he decides that he would rather work there, he will keep his mouth shut. It is a cartel....

Zsille: ...against the chief method of the worker's struggle. At the time of what they call the economic reform it was a general tactic for the workers and generally the most talented to constantly change jobs; they would go, let us say, into an auxiliary plant of a producer cooperative for a 2 forints higher hourly wage; then when the auxiliary plant was closed or failed they would go back to their old job, for another raise of 2 forints. So the reward for the "faithful ones" was a loss of 4 forints.

[Question] It now appears that they want to continue the reform. Do they want competition, higher efficiency?

[Answer] Zsille: Efficiency was always a slogan. The question of work and plant organization, for example; I do not know how many times this has come before the supreme party forum, how many times they passed resolutions about it. Every two or three years they put out the same slogans, word for word, and then nothing happens, or if it does it is nicely undone in a little while.

Balajthy: This system is incapable of economic efficiency.

Zsille: This is a function of centralism, which will be the chief aspiration of the system until the entire world is one enterprise.

[Question] But decentralization is taking place in Hungary now, is it not?

[Answer] Balajthy: In the final analysis decentralization is not in the interest of the state; what is involved is an ideological trick.

Zsille: The concentration of power means economically that they try to hold an ever greater mass of people and assets in one hand. The decentralization slogans always appear after the completion of a gigantic centralization epoch and the creation of mammoths larger than ever before, the accumulation of an even greater bankrupt estate. In my opinion this creation of large factories is a deadend not only in the East but also in the West, the organization of junk-manufacture.

[Question] Who actually decides what will be manufactured?

Balajthy: Frequently they decide at the highest level even about the most minor products, if it affects military or political interests. If it is decided in Moscow or if a minister likes something on a foreign trip then half the country will manufacture it and the populace must buy it. I do not know, for example, whose idea it was but once the producer cooperatives received loans only for planting poplars. And they planted them--on the best fields. This was a very spectacular "development." Or when there was the grape planting program, they bestrewed the Great Plain and a number of other places [with grape vines] which were not suitable for quality wine production. In the meantime they let the historic Hungarian wine country go to ruin or they deliberately ruined it, pursuing a grape planting program with investments which won't pay for themselves in 10 years, if ever.

[Question] Who, what sort of people, stand behind the reform program?

Balajthy: One should know about the reform guard, the believers in independence and decentralization, that they were the ones who started the most reactionary program of the last decade of Hungarian politics, the uniting of villages and cooperatives, as a result of which one-third of the villages in Hungary lost their independence and came under joint administration. They also united the agricultural and consumer cooperatives, which now sometimes cover ten or eleven communities, with the terribly idiotic excuse that this would create optimal operational size. One-third of the country was simply erased from the map, making decision making and voting impossible. They took away our jobs, shops, trains, buses and schools. They even organized the parishes into districts; the priests zigzag among 4-5 villages, performing christenings, marriages and burials. And it is not certain that they will arrive in time to administer last rites.

[Question] Are not such questions debated in advance at social forums?

Zsille: Sure, they are. Then they do everything just as they had already decided in advance. For example, there was a debate in MAGYAR NEMZET about whether there should be a streetcar on Rakoczi Street. The larger half of the contributors were of the opinion that there should be. The debate was closed and the streetcar service was eliminated.

[Question] But I think that even such debates have limits?

Balajthy: Yes. For example, Minister Pal Romany fell when he spoke on TV against the unification of producer cooperatives.

[Question] So people come to see sooner or later that there is no sense in participating in the debates?

[Answer] Zsille: Precisely. The majority of people simply do not believe that their opinion will be taken into consideration. I frequently participated in so-called production conferences. In general as a sociologist, doing research on factory democracy, but also as a worker, when I worked in a factory. The majority of people simply wouldn't think of going to these meetings. There were some who spent time there until it was time for the train, because it was warmer

than at the station. To what would they speak? At the beginning they read the figures on factory plan fulfillment, of which they do not understand a word, then a couple of birds who are still young or already senile, or crazy--generally always the same ones--get up and say for the twentieth or fiftieth time that the lavatory is disgusting, that the exhaust isn't working, etc. The others laugh at them, or sleep. They know that nothing will happen.

Balajthy: I think that we will slowly get beyond this apathy, which was a salubrious product of consolidation. For a time--for a long time--Kadarism was able to make the majority of people feel that it was senseless to speak up. But now, as a result of Poland among other things, I think this is coming to an end.

Zsille: Simply because they have experienced enough times that there is no sense in speaking up, that they should not speak up.

[Question] So?

[Answer] Zsille: In many places the bosses no longer dare even take a stroll in the factory courtyard. They are afraid that they will be subject to questioning, that they will be asked how long it will be necessary to work in poisoned air. Sometimes a lower ranking official or a leader infuriated by something will stand with the workers. I remember one case in the Ganz-Mavag when the trade union made use of its veto right and stopped production in one of the plants because it was hazardous to life. On paper the trade unions have a veto right to stop production despite an opposing directive of the economic leaders in such cases, or if the workers are given tasks outside their sphere of work or if they are forced to work for a wage lower than prescribed. I have not heard, however, that this has happened elsewhere. And even here the only result was that the trade union secretary was removed, and production continued.

Balajthy: You can see this in the accident statistics.

Zsille: When the Central Control Committee was discussing the matter of my appeal there were two expelled party members also who had been leaders who ran into a matter similar to that of the Ganz-Mavag trade union secretary. One had dealt with labor protection in a pharmaceutical factory. He reported in a letter that there was danger of an explosion in one of the plants, that production should be halted. They did not halt it, there was an explosion and two people died. But his letter disappeared, and since he was a naive man he had no copy of it. If he had been "clever" he could have gotten through with a minor disciplinary charge, but he grasped at every straw to prove that he had not been responsible for the accident, because he had reported the danger, but his chief had destroyed the letter. They started proceedings against him at three levels; he was written up for slandering his chief, and since he could not prove that he really had written the letter the court condemned him. Since they made him responsible for the accident he was dismissed from his job and expelled from the party too. When I met him he gave the impression of a completely ruined man; he had been in the hospital several times, with ulcers and a nervous breakdown. He may have died since then.

The other had earlier been a higher ranking leader, before he had the misfortune of being elected to an experts' committee for a KNEB [Central People's Control Committee] investigation. The investigation was to determine whether or not a director accused of embezzlement was guilty. As a lecturer from the party center said at the National Leader Training Center, in such cases: "What is important is not whether or not the person embezzled but rather, is he with us or against us?" But the KNEB expert didn't know this. He did not know that it was his task to find the director guilty if he had lost the favor of his superiors; but if he was a "regular comrade" he must be cleared of the ill-willed slander and the slanderers must be unmarked. He chose an easier solution, he wrote the truth, that the director had embezzled. He did not win and they expelled him from the party.

The third example is from a ship factory where the internal auditor of the factory believed that he should disclose that they were stealing wood from the factory to build a week-end house. Later, however, it turned out that he was mistaken. His mistake was pointed out to him in a unique way--they always mixed a little poison in his coffee, and often warmly urged him to drink it. When they told him at the Public Health and Epidemiology Station that he had cyanide in his tissues he decided to moderate his internal auditing.

[Question] Do the workers steal too?

[Answer] Zsille: Yes; but I would rather say that they steal back. In many places, for example, they have taken away their right to take home certain waste materials which cannot be used in the factory. Good sense and a sense of justice suggest to people that even after that they can still take them home, but now it is stealing.

Balajthy: This way everyone will be muddled and black, feel guilty, lose the moral foundation to criticize, to unmask their bosses--who embezzle a thousand times as much as they do--because they are taking off one piece of wood or one sack of nails, so they are thieves too, and can be blackmailed. Somehow this black compromise is the essence of Kadarism. Now, perhaps, when the standard of living is decreasing so quickly people will increasingly see that there is no sense in keeping their mouths shut for the possibility of a little black business because even in this way they will not be able to live substantially better. And it will be worth while to create a clear situation.

[Question] To what extent are the intellectuals corrupted? As I see it they have been given room for maneuver, so they are willing to recognize the limits.

[Answer] Balajthy: I do not agree that there is much room for maneuver. The intellectuals have always had greater independence among the Poles. In Hungary a large number of the intellectuals collaborated, and received nothing for this politically, only relative material well-being--economically. He who was not sufficiently corrupt and immoral sooner or later fell out of the ranks of the intellectuals. The prison years came after the moral revival of 1956, and after the amnesty some of the condemned went almost straight from prison to state posts. This was Kadar's great compromise with the intellectuals--with all respect

to the exceptions, to those with whom a compromise could not be made--this pulled the moral ground out from under the feet of the intellectual opposition.

[Question] Where are the limits to collaboration?

[Answer] Balajthy: They are not bringing new troops into this compromise. This served only the post-1956 consolidation. Several generations have grown up since then, among them people who have graduated from the university and who have not been given conditions for a minimal human existence, not to speak of an intellectual existence. They did not even want to come to an agreement with these generations. So they had no other opportunity--either they fit in or they are forced to the margin of existence; even in the physical sense there is no room for them in Hungarian intellectual life. And in every age group there are those who are not inclined to fit in.

[Question] Where does the opposition political movement stand in Hungary today?

[Answer] Zsille: In Poland the present state of affairs was preceded by an opposition, intellectual movement of many years in which the most important motif was that it created the solidarity of intellectuals and workers. It used to be said about Hungary that there was no sign of this there, that there was no link between the opposition intellectuals and the workers. In my opinion we in Hungary are about where the Poles were 5 years ago. But it does not require another 5 years for us to reach the present Polish state of affairs. Obviously this developmental process will be linked with a differentiation of the opposition. And I hope that the differences of the groups with different origins, career paths, attitudes and social contacts will be articulated and that these groups will appear before the public with their own characteristic faces. Some would force the development of a uniform position, force us to act as if the Hungarian opposition were some sort of homogeneous society. God protect us from this. There is no need for this neo-Bolshevism, nor for the appearance of it. This does not mean that there might not be very strong solidarity in various actions, or an identity of views on the most important questions. But in my opinion a really valuable and lasting solidarity can come into being only if we do not fool each other, and ourselves, that we are the same in everything and agree on everything. Let us leave this to the communist "comrades." We know how much it's worth.

Balajthy: Somehow all this is interdependent with that change which took place after 1956. Up to then the majority of people had started out from the pre-1945 structure of Hungarian society and regarded the position occupied in that as one's true position, to which one's new position was compared, and evaluated what had happened to them from this viewpoint. There was a leveling after 1956 which lasted a good 20 years and in which people became like one another, their real roles became similar. That was when this system really became final in the awareness of people, when the Stalinist, Rakosi-ist version fell and was replaced by Kadarism. This was the effect of fear and apathy. Now, I think, a new epoch is beginning, people are breaking out of this leveled mass. It is not possible and it is not necessary to reconstruct the former structure of Hungarian society, but people must seek those roots and traditions which will really help society to survive.

in the village, for example, small property can be created anew and strengthened. This practically exists today, only now it exists in constant fear of repression, behind the black curtain of the black compromise. A different sort of economic policy would be required to strengthen it--organizing support, credit, transportation and purchasing on the basis of the interests of producers and consumers. And one might form true cooperatives, which were tried for only one or two weeks after 1945 when a few still believed that there would be democracy in Hungary. After that these were quickly dispersed and the state "cooperatives" were created. The new Hungarian democracy might be built in the villages on the small peasant and cooperative traditions.

[Question] But to what extent are these traditions alive?

[Answer] Zsille: They are alive, they always were alive, only they were beaten to the ground, buried. And if they got fresh air they would come to life in moments. This entire household plot thing, from which the country is living, is nothing more than private farming, a farmer economy behind a socialist screen. The only way in which it is socialist is that now the peasants get back a part of their one-time fields from the producer cooperative, which is part of the socialist sector.

[Question] And are the intellectuals sufficiently prepared to keep up with the changes now maturing in the depths, if these should come to the surface?

[Answer] Zsille: The SzeTA--the Fund to Support the Poor [Szegenyeket Tamagato Alap]--is the first and so far the only organization of the democratic Hungarian intellectuals the activity of which, in regard to its essence and program, goes beyond the circles of the intellectuals, creates a link with people belonging to other strata of society, does its work among them and regards a protection of their interests and an improvement of their fate as its task and goal. This now involves the most down and out strata of society, and therefore the least active; to help them, this is the goal and program of the SzeTA, nothing more. The SzeTA is not a cover organization of activists for some anti-state program, not some sort of opposition political center, although there are those around the SzeTA and especially opposed to the SzeTA who, guided by their Bolshevik instincts, are capable of thinking and want to think only in terms of some sort of uniform organization and organizational center. Obviously it is easier for the party center to hypothesize a counter-center and it would make the work of the police more convenient if they had to reckon only with a few chief ringleaders. But unfortunately we cannot help them; there was no Central Committee for the protest action against the 1979 trials in Prague and there is none for the SzeTA either. But it is also clear to me that the SzeTA will be the common cradle of later political and non-political organizations and movements, possibly parties, with various political and ideological orientations and having various functions, which will be the frameworks for the meeting of the most varied social groups and the tools for their cooperation. This is clear because those who founded the SzeTA and make it work are dealing not only with this. Whatever may be involved, if it requires clear vision, honest and brave men, we will find them there first. And it is clear also because there is no other; the SzeTA is being joined by those coming from the most varied directions, who are politically active against the regime in very different ways and with different goals, at least outside the official political frameworks.

Balajthy: I would not underestimate nor be afraid of the fact that an intellectual was bringing "only" his traditional values "into public." That he is literate, that he has been taught the various forms of social contact, etc. Perhaps this is the way he can be of most use. He might set up a table in the market and people could go to him with all kinds of problems and complaints, requests that he could formulate and put into shape for them.

Zsille: This is part of the SzeTA program, a legal aid service.*

Balajthy: But this requires a different sort of intellectual. This cannot be done while at the same time informally seeking the patronage of the party center, or while peddling our samizdat articles to official publishers.

Zsille: Everything which exists in Poland today has been started in Hungary too-- or, of course, has been continued. Now the journalists are describing things there, filling their readers with sensations, and getting fat themselves by doing it, and getting drunk on wonders. Because according to them there is nothing in Hungary today, they do not notice anything, just as in Poland a year ago nothing would have been noticed of what was brewing and at which they wonder today. It appears that that was and remains their job, to understand nothing and then to be surprised. There are flying or migratory universities in Hungary too, the nucleus of which was formed 10 years ago; but there has been systematic education too for 5 or 6 years already. Obviously these universities also will go beyond the intellectual circles as happened in Poland. To do this, of course, will require just those people about whom the least has been said thus far when we talk about the opposition. I am talking about that plebian wing of the opposition intellectuals who are of plebian origin themselves or, if they are not, were born and grew up in an environment where they became acquainted with and lived the life of the working classes or of the poor; they understand and speak their language. This does not involve some sort of new people's or proletarian intelligentsia; there are also many among them who got close to the "plebes" by virtue of their work, their impoverished, struggling way of life, which can be achieved by honest intellectuals, or by virtue of their inner moral promptings. This sort of people already gives the SzeTA its character, they are the most active and self-sacrificing members and this is the most dominant trend of this not at all homogenous organizing activity. This is not some sort of elite intellectual grouping as the Budapest School was, not some sort of new-left, Maoist-Trotskyite-Marxist circle which also gained popularity in the strata of the elite intellectual youth. Of course, there is no uniform ideological platform in the SzeTA, but if I think of those who work hardest in this movement and play an initiative-taking role and who stand closest to me also they are simply people who have had enough of the various Marxisms, who are interested by those best historical and cultural traditions, spiritual and material values which were buried by the refuse of various foreign armies and the deposits of their ideological currents, and to which we must return. Marxism, as the theory of a minority, conspiratorial,

*The SzeTA published a detailed report about its activity in the fall of 1980. This material can be found in issue No 1981/1-2 of the Paris IRODALMI UJSAG and in issue No 1981/1 of the BECSI NAPLO, Vienna. -- The editors.

intellectual movement, and especially the Leninist, Bolshevik version of it exported to us, does not belong among the best Hungarian traditions.

Balajthy: The SzeTA has pointed out precisely what everybody already knew or could have known if they wanted to take cognizance of such things as were destroying public feeling in the process of collaborating with the power, namely that there are very many in Hungary who were left out of the Kadar compromise or were the losers in it, and live in poverty.

Zsille: Many western journalists have also contributed to the creation of false appearances; they put up at the Hilton and if they go for a walk they get no farther than the golden shops on Kigyo Street in order to confirm that people stand in line or that one can buy salami in the Inner City. They don't have 5 minutes to go a little farther to see what emergency housing is like or how a citizen of Ferencvaros, let us say, is living in penury a few hundred meters from the golden shops. I sometimes think the Newspaper Publishing Enterprise is paying for these articles.

Balajthy: In general they judge the Hungarian standard of living and the supply of goods on the basis of the displays along the highway leading to the west. They probably never got to those villages which "fell from the tree of the living law."

Zsille: The truth is that many members of the opposition themselves do not have a precise picture of how millions of Hungarians really live and how much they work for it. And for the time being the problem still is that the members of the SzeTA, most of whom are poor themselves, who have no jobs and little money, should be able to go down to the poorest parts of the country and make a systematic survey on a national scale of the state of poverty in Hungary today. They should repeat that research which was done 10 years ago under the leadership of Istvan Kemeny, on an official commission, the results of which were then buried in a safe. What is needed for this is that the SzeTA, which is becoming ever more popular and which is mobilizing an ever broader public opinion with its ever more successful public actions, should be able to finance such sociological work through the support, primarily, of the domestic more well-to-do strata and, perhaps, the Hungarian emigration, should be able to support, with scholarships and by covering their costs, those who undertake this work. I am confident that the SzeTA will get this support.

Balajthy: More people can be mobilized more easily today by the charitable goals of the SzeTA than would be the case with a radical platform of an organization with a definitely political character. But if social processes accelerate the institutionalization of politics will be unavoidable; let us think of 1956 or of Poland today. Then it will not be 20 or 100 Budapest intellectuals demanding what is the goal of the SzeTA. Actually this is a temporary and emergency solution, with the intellectuals playing a fermenting role and acting in the interest of those who are not yet strong enough or determined enough to make their own demands themselves. When that time comes I would rather join a grouping which represents the interests of colleagues, of people belonging to the intelligentsia. Because this problem is still before us. There is a fund to support the poor, but who supports the members of the fund to support the poor?

[Question] Do you think that in the near future, perhaps as a result of the events in Poland, the progressive processes will accelerate in Hungary?

[Answer] Zsille: Istvan Bibó once told me that in August 1956 he asked a few university students who had come to him for some sort of unofficial seminar: "What is your opinion, will the students react if there is some sort of radical turn in Hungarian politics?" The majority of them were of the opinion that nothing else interested the students, only where they could get a job and how they could get housing. Whatever happened they would not react, they would stay home. This was in August and a few months later, as you know, the students were in the streets.

8984

CSO: 2500/260

DRAFT LAW ON AGRICULTURAL SELF-GOVERNMENT FORMULATED

Warsaw TRYBUNA LUDU in Polish 23 Mar 81 pp 4, 5

[Text of Draft Law on Agricultural Self-Government]

[Text] The Presidium of Sejm has submitted to social consultation a draft law on agricultural self-government.

On 6 March 1981, as is well known, at a session of the Sejm, the first reading of this document took place. The draft was then sent for consultation to voivodship parliamentar groups, government, organizations of agricultural circles and agricultural sectorial associations, rural cooperative movement unions, and scientific research centers. The final date of social consultation of the draft law on agricultural self-government is to be 13 April 1981.

Observations and proposals submitted in connection with the draft will be examined by the Sejm commissions and then the draft law on agricultural self-government will be laid before the Sejm for the second reading.

The draft text is as follows:

Individual [private] farming plays a fundamental role in providing food for the nation. Individual farms are permanent constituents of the agricultural economy of the country. The Polish People's Republic recognizes and protects, on the basis of standing laws, the individual ownership of these farms and the right of their inheritance; it ensures help necessary for their development, creates conditions ensuring the economic, social and cultural progress of the countryside, and the social-professional status of individual farmers, possession of equal rights with other professions, as well as the rise in the standard of living of farmers. It backs development of the self-government of farmers, as a representative of their professional and social interests before organs of the state administration, state and social economic units acting on behalf of the countryside and agriculture, and as one of the links of socialist democracy in the countryside. Taking all this into consideration and to ensure to the self-government of individual farmers a full share in deciding on matters connected with development of agricultural economy and social progress in the countryside, it is being enacted as follows:

Chapter I

General Provisions

Art 1

1. Individual farmers and members of their families, and other persons directly connected with agriculture, can voluntarily associate, on the lines established in the present law, in the social-professional organizations of individual farmers, called hereafter "organizations of agricultural self-government."
2. Organizations of agricultural self-government are voluntary, independent of organs of the state administration and other organs and organizational units and organizations, self-governing organizations of individual farmers, acting through the organs established in accordance with statutes adopted by these organizations democratically elected, which define independently, within the scope of legal regulations in force, the range and forms of their activity.
3. Organizations, to which reference is made in Para 1, represent the needs and defend the professional and social interests of individual farmers, act for development of individual agricultural farms and the enhancement of their production, look after high standing of the farmer's profession and conditions of his life and work, cooperate in shaping the state policy for continued economic, public, social and cultural-educational progress of the countryside.

Art 2

1. Organizations of agricultural self-government are as follows:
 - 1) agricultural circles, rural homemakers circles, and unions of agricultural circles and organizations;
 - 2) agricultural sectorial associations and unions of agricultural sectorial associations;
 - 3) central union of agricultural circles and associations.
2. Organizations of agricultural self-government act in accordance with provisions of the present law and other legal provisions in force, and structural principles of the Polish People's Republic, on the basis of the registered statute consistent with these provisions and principles.

Art 3

1. The law defines the rights and duties of organizations of agricultural self-government and principles and conditions of uniting:
 - 1) of persons mentioned in Art 1, Para 1--into agricultural circles and into agricultural sectorial organizations;
 - 2) of agricultural circles--into unions of agricultural circles and organizations;

3) of agricultural sectorial associations--into unions of agricultural sectorial associations;

4) of unions of agricultural circles and organizations and of unions of agricultural sectorial associations--into a central union of agricultural circles and organizations.

2. The law does not preclude persons mentioned in Art 1, Para 1 from joining in social and professional organizations of individual farmers organized and functioning on the basis of other particular provisions.

Art 4

1. Agricultural circles are voluntary, independent and self-governing social-professional organizations of individual farmers.

2. Those who can be members of agricultural circles are:

1) persons managing individual agricultural farms as their owners, possessors, or usufructuaries;

2) persons managing jointly as a team individual agricultural farms, as their owners, possessors, or usufructuaries;

3) adult members of families of farmers mentioned in subparas 1 and 2, working in agricultural farms managed by them;

4) persons who made over their farms for annuity or pension to heirs or state.

3. Detailed rules and conditions of the joining or withdrawal of members from agricultural circles are defined by the statutes of the circles; the statute may also envision the acceptance as members of the agricultural circle of persons other than those mentioned in Para 2, but who are directly connected with agriculture by the nature of their work.

Art 5

1. Rural homemakers circles function as detached organizational units of agricultural circles.

2. Rural homemakers circles represent in particular the interests of rural women, look after matters concerning rural families and the upbringing of the young generation of the countryside, take on social-upbringing and cultural-educational activity in the countryside, are active in stimulating rural women socially and professionally, propagate progress in housekeeping and look after improvement of the working and living conditions of women.

3. Rural homemakers circles operate on the basis of regulations adopted by them, which define the aims and tasks of the circle, means to achieve them, procedure of passing resolutions by organs of the circle, and their rights and duties. The regulation may envision the participation in the activities of the circle of women who are not members of the agricultural circle but are connected with the rural environment by the nature of their work.

4. In villages where agricultural circles are not in operation, independent rural homemakers circles can be established and act on the basis of regulations registered in the gmina [rural parish] union of agricultural circles and organizations.

5. The rural homemakers circles mentioned in Para 4 act as detached organizational units of the gmina unions of agricultural circles and organizations. Accordingly the provisions of Paras 2 and 3 are applicable to these circles.

Art 6

1. Agricultural sectorial associations are voluntary, independent and self-governing social-professional organizations of individual farmers specializing in definite vegetable or animal production.

2. The provisions of Art 4, Paras 2 and 3, are applicable respectively to the membership in agricultural sectorial associations.

Art 7

The membership in an agricultural circle does not exclude a membership in an agricultural sectorial association, nor the membership in the agricultural sectorial association, a membership in the agricultural circle.

Art 8

1. The following organizations are functioning in their capacity as unions of independent, self-governing organizations of the agricultural self-government:

- 1) gmina and voivodship unions of agricultural circles and organizations;
- 2) regional, voivodship, district and national unions of agricultural sectorial associations;

The Central Union of Agricultural Circles and Organizations, as an independent and self-governing, democratically elected representation of individual farmers in relation to the organs of the state administration and other organs, organizational units and organizations at the level of the gmina, voivodship and nation.

2. The Central Union of Agricultural Circles and Organizations bands together the voivodship unions of agricultural circles and organizations and national unions of agricultural sectorial associations.

3. The detailed principles and conditions of association into unions mentioned in Para 1 are defined by the law and statutes of these unions.

Chapter II

Powers of Organizations of Agricultural Self-Government and Principles of Cooperation of These Organizations with Organs of State Administration and Organizations Acting for the Benefit of Agriculture

Art 9

1. The organizations of agricultural self-government, representing professional and social needs and interests of individual farmers, are entitled to submit to the proper state organs and state organizational units, as well to cooperative organizations and other socioeconomic organizations in charge of carrying out assignments for the benefit of the individual farming, their opinions, proposals, postulates, and demands, in the matter of:

- 1) the needs of individual farms pertaining to seed production, pedigree breeding stock, technical equipment, investment materials, supply of energy, requirements connected with water economy, improvement, conservation, recultivation and consolidation of divided plots and development of services for the benefit of individual farms;
- 2) the turnover and management of soil, organization and conditions of contracting for supplying farm products purchase prices of these products and economic incentives in this regard, prices for means, materials, equipment, installations and other items necessary for farms, credit policies and burden of taxation of farms, obligatory and voluntary insurance in agriculture;
- 3) socioeconomic plans inasmuch as they concern the countryside and agriculture, and plans of territorial development of farms and villages;
- 4) the development and the activity of educational, upbringing and cultural centers and health services in the rural environment;
- 5) the distribution and activity of commercial, servicing and mass-nutrition centers in the countryside;
- 6) the improvement of working conditions of farmers, insurance of necessary protective and working clothing for them, safe-handling technical equipment and work implements, and proper--with regard to health protection--chemical agents for the production and cultivation of plants;
- 7) steady progress in the living standards of the rural population, and insurance of social security of farmers for old age, ill-health, accidents at work, and disability.

2. The organs of the state administration and the state organizational units, as well as the cooperative organizations and other organizations, are obliged to cooperate with organizations of agricultural self-government within the scope of the distribution of means, materials, equipment, installations, and other items for the needs of individual agriculture.

3. The Council of Ministers, by means of a decree, shall define the obligations of organs of the state administration and organizational units and organizations, mentioned in Paras 1 and 2, pertaining to cooperation with organizations of agricultural self-government in the matters mentioned in these provisions, including the forms of the obligatory request for opinion organizations of the agricultural self-government in the matter of draft plans and programs and draft normative acts pertaining to matters mentioned in Paras 1 and 2.

Art 10

1. The organs, organizational units and organizations, mentioned in Art 9, Para 1, are under obligation to take a position, at the latest within a month, toward opinions, proposals, postulates, or requests, presented by the agricultural self-government organization, and failing a possibility of taking an attitude toward them within this time limit, to make known, without undue delay, within what time a position shall be taken toward the matter being submitted.

2. In case when the position taken toward a definite matter by the pertinent organ, organizational unit, or organization, does not satisfy the agricultural self-government organization, it may lodge an objection before a pertinent organ, organizational unit, or organization of a higher level; the objection should be considered within a month, or a direct mediation with participation of representatives from the interested parties should be undertaken within this period of time.

Art 11

1. If, in the matters mentioned in Art 10, Para 1, no agreement is reached by the procedure envisioned in Art 10, Para 2, whereas the matter at issue concerns the vital rights and interests of farmers, to support its demands, the pertinent organization of agricultural self-government, as an exceptional step, can resort to a protest action by farmers.

2. The protest action mentioned in Para 1 can be taken by organizations of agricultural self-government of at least gmina level, provided they are done as follows:

1) organizations of the gmina level--in coordination with the organization at the voivodship level;

2) organizations of the voivodship and district level and national unions of agricultural sectorial associations--in coordination with the Central Union of Agricultural Circles and Organizations;

3) the Central Union of Agricultural Circles and Associations--on the basis of the resolution of the pertinent statutory organ of the union.

3. About the taking of the protest action, its organizer shall inform the organ, organizational unit, or organization mentioned in Art 10, Para 2, with 7-day notice.

4. The participation of farmers in the protest action is voluntary. No one can be coerced to participate or to refuse to participate in such an action.

5. The organizer of the protest action is under obligation to ensure an appropriate course of the protest action so that it not disturb public law and order and social interest.

Art 12

1. Within the scope of their activities aimed at the development of individual agricultural farms and economic and social progress of the countryside, the organizations of agricultural self-government, in particular:

- 1) initiate and render assistance in the development and implementation of technical progress in individual farms, generalizing the achievements of science and technology and the experience of leading farmers;
 - 2) render assistance in the activation of agricultural farms, the increase of their production and development of agricultural specialization and cooperation;
 - 3) provide farmers advice and help in the choice and application of rational forms and methods of management and the use of proper measures and agrotechnical, zootechnical and technological means in agricultural production and storage;
 - 4) propagate professional and social knowledge among farmers and would-be farmers and uphold the reputation of the farmer's profession;
 - 5) generalize rational methods of management of household economy, nutrition of the family and health protection.
2. Organizations of agricultural self-government cooperate with other social and economic organizations of farmers, and, in case of need, conclude with these organizations the pertinent agreements and arrangements on cooperation or implementation of joint tasks.
 3. In cases where it is justified by the aims and tasks specified in the present law and statutes of individual organizations of agricultural self-government, these organizations on the basis of the code of administrative proceedings, can require the proper organs of the state administration to institute administrative proceedings, or admittance to participation in pending administrative proceedings in a definite individual case.
 4. The Council of Ministers can define the form and scope of the aid of the state to organizations of agricultural self-government for carrying on by these organizations of activities mentioned in Para 1.

Art 13

1. The organizations of agricultural self-government, by virtue of the principles defined in the statute, can:
 - 1) organize and carry on service and production activities for the needs of farmers and the countryside;
 - 2) organize help for farmers and the rural population in producing by one's own means building materials from local raw materials, and in satisfying needs in the area of machinery and equipment, on the basis of neighborly aid or joint moves of farmers' teams;
 - 3) initiate and organize production cooperation for the purpose of intensifying and specializing agricultural production;
 - 4) initiate and organize social activities.
2. The Council of Ministers, after seeking the advice of the Central Union of Agricultural Circles and Organizations, shall define, by way of an order, the conditions and forms of carrying on by organizations of agricultural self-government the activities mentioned in Para 1, subparas 1-3.

Art 14

1. In matters connected with carrying out supply contract agreements, purchase of agricultural products, providing farms with the means of production, building materials and others, performance of services for these farms, ameliorative, hydraulic, power supply, and other investments implemented for their sake, liquidation of random and game damages, organizations of agricultural self-government are entitled to exercise social control through their authorized representatives.

2. The organs, organizational units and organizations subject to the control mentioned in Para 1 are under obligation to render the exercise of this control possible by organizations of agricultural self-government.

3. The Council of Ministers, after taking the advice of the Central Union of Agricultural Circles and Organizations, shall define, by way of an executive order, the scope and form of the control mentioned in Para 1, the way of formulation and presentation of the results of this control and the mode of implementation of the post-control motions, as well as obligations of the organs, organizational units and organizations in this respect.

Art 15

1. The organizations of agricultural self-government shall keep accounts and records representing their economic activity and changes in property elements.

2. The Central Union of Agricultural Circles and Organizations, after coordination with the Minister of Finance, shall establish the principles of carrying on accounts, drawing up and approval of balance sheets and accounts.

Chapter III

Agricultural Circles

Art 16

1. The area of the activity of an agricultural circle can be one or more of the neighboring villages belonging to the same gmina.

2. The agricultural circle can unite persons mentioned in Art 4, Para 2, Subparas 1-3, that manage farms in the area of its activity, or who work on such farms, and as regards persons mentioned in Art 4, Para 2, Subpara 4, those residing in the area of the activity of the agricultural circle.

Art 17

1. The statute of an agricultural circle should state:

- 1) the name and place of business of the circle;
- 2) the subjective and territorial scope of its activity;

- 3) the objective and targets of the circle and means of their implementation;
- 4) the manner of admission and resignation of members and loss of membership;
- 5) the rights and duties of members;
- 6) the method of setting membership fees;
- 7) the organizational structure of the circle;
- 8) organs of the circle, their competence, their term of office and the mode of their election and revocation before the expiry of tenure;
- 9) conditions of adoption and validity of resolutions of the organs of the circle;
- 10) the manner of representation of the circle on the outside;
- 11) the property of the circle and method of managing this property;
- 12) the manner of entering into financial obligations by the circle;
- 13) principles of the distribution of surplus from the economic activity carried out;
- 14) the manner of changing the statute;
- 15) the manner of liquidating the circle.

2. In the organizational structure of circles the statute may institute sections or specialized circles, corresponding to the interests of members (producers of specific cultures, breeders, mechanizers), young farmers circles, and others.

3. The Central Union of Agricultural Circles and Organizations defines principles which should be complied with by the statutes of agricultural circles and the bylaws of rural homemakers circles.

Art 18

1. The initiative for the formation of the agricultural circle may be taken by at least 10 founder members, managing farms as the owners, possessors, or usufructuaries of such farms.

2. The founding members elect from among themselves a five-member founders' committee and adopt the statute of the agricultural circle. The election of the founders' committee is confirmed by their signatures in the application for the registration of the circle and its statute, and the adoption of the statute--by the signing of it and stating their residence, and persons managing a farm--also the location of farm being managed.

Art 19

1. The agricultural circle and its statute must be registered.

2. Changes of the statute of the agricultural circle must also be registered; the adoption of a new statute by the existing circle is also understood as a change of the statute.

3. From the moment of the registration mentioned in Para 1, the agricultural circle acquires the status of a legal person.

Art 20

1. The registering organ enters into the register the circle being set up and its statute, or changes in the statute already in existence, if they comply with requirements defined by the law.

2. If the registering organ should establish that the draft statute or its changes do not fulfill the requirements specified in Para 1, it will make registration of the agricultural circle or changes in its statute contingent upon effecting the appropriate changes in the statute or in the change of the statute, and assign to this end a suitable date.

3. The agricultural circle is subject to removal from the register, if:

1) in accordance with the statute, a resolution shall be adopted that the circle be dissolved;

2) the adopted change of the statute does not comply with the requirements specified in the law, and if the agricultural circle shall not adopt a resolution to remove the existing flaws indicated by the registering organ in its decision, or shall not desist from the change of the statute;

3) the number of members of the circle shall drop below the number specified in Art 18, Para 1.

Art 21

1. Until the agricultural circle being newly formed is registered, and then until the election in accordance with its statute of its organs, so far as the provisions of the law do not provide otherwise, its founders' committee acts in behalf of the circle.

2. Up to that time, the founders are vested with the authority of the general meeting of the agricultural circle, and the founders' committee has the authority of the executive organ of the circle; during this time they take steps necessary for the formation and registration of the circle and its statute, and then--for the election of its statutory organs.

3. The members of the founders' committee are jointly and severally responsible for actions performed on behalf of the agricultural circle affecting third parties, whereas for obligations resulting from these actions after the registration of the circle, the agricultural circle is responsible, as it is for the obligations incurred by itself, provided that the members of the founders' committee are accountable for them to the circle in accordance with the provisions of the civil law.

Art 22

1. The agricultural circles unite into gmina unions of circles and agricultural organizations, whereas if such unions are not established in the gminas--into voivodship unions of agricultural circles and organizations.
2. The agricultural circles can also be founders and members of cooperatives being established for providing services for individual farmers.
3. Provisions of the law on cooperatives and their unions mentioned in Para 2 apply to the cooperatives.

Chapter IV

Agricultural Sectorial Associations

Art 23

The sphere of the activity of the agricultural sectorial association may consist of one or more villages belonging to the same gmina, the area of the gmina or more gminas of the given voivodship, one voivodship or more voivodships.

Art 24

In the matter of statutes and the establishment and registration of agricultural sectorial associations apply the corresponding provisions relating to agricultural circles.

Chapter V

Gmina and Voivodship Unions of Agricultural Circles and Organizations

Art 25

1. Gmina and voivodship unions of agricultural circles and organizations are independent, self-governing associations:

- 1) gmina unions--of agricultural circles and, on a voluntary basis, of agricultural sectorial associations and other social and economic farmers organizations;
- 2) voivodship unions--of gmina unions of agricultural circles and organizations, and, on a voluntary basis, of agricultural sectorial associations and unions of agricultural sectorial associations and other social and economic farmers organizations.

2. The area of the activity of the unions mentioned in Para 1 are correspondingly--gmina and voivodship.

Art 26

1. The initiative for the formation of a gmina union of agricultural circles and organizations may be taken by at least three agricultural circles, and that of a

voivodship union of agricultural circles and organizations, five gmina unions of agricultural circles and organizations, called hereafter founders' circles and founders' unions.

2. The establishment of a gmina union of agricultural circles and organizations requires the adoption of resolutions by the general meetings of the founders' circles, and the establishment of the voivodship union of agricultural circles and organizations--resolutions of the general meeting of delegates of founders' unions.

Art 27

1. In the matter of the establishment of a gmina union of agricultural circles and organizations and of a voivodship union of agricultural circles and organizations, the founders' circles and founders' unions act through persons belonging to their executive organs.

2. The persons mentioned in Para 1 act in the capacity of the assembly of founders of the gmina or voivodship union of agricultural circles and organizations.

3. The founders' assembly of the gmina or voivodship union of agricultural circles and organizations elects from among themselves a five-member founders' committee of the union being established and adopts its statute. The election of the founders' committee is confirmed by the members of the founders' assembly in the application for registration of the union and its statute, and the adoption of the statute--by the affixing their signatures to it, specifying their functions exercised in the founders' union and their residence.

Art 28

To gmina and voivodship unions of agricultural circles and organizations, in matters not regulated in arts 25-27, apply the appropriate provisions of the law relating to agricultural circles.

Chapter VI

Unions of Agricultural Sectorial Associations

Art 29

1. Unions of agricultural sectorial associations unite agricultural sectorial associations specialized in a definite or related vegetable or animal production.

2. The sphere of activity of the unions mentioned in Para 1 may be a region, a voivodship, a district, or the area of the entire country.

3. National unions of agricultural sectorial associations unite in the Central Union of Agricultural Circles and Associations.

Art 30

The provisions relating to agricultural circles apply correspondingly to unions of agricultural sectorial associations in matters of the statute and registration,

whereas in the matter of the establishment of these organizations the provisions relating to the gmina and voivodship unions of agricultural circles and organizations are correspondingly applicable.

Chapter VII

The Central Union of Agricultural Circles and Organizations

Art 31

1. The Central Union of Agricultural Circles and Organizations, called hereafter the central union, is a nationwide, independent and self-governing association of the unions of agricultural circles and organizations and of national unions of agricultural sectorial associations.

2. The statute of the central union is liable to registration.

Art 32

1. The statute of the central union is being adopted by the national congress of delegates of the agricultural circles and agricultural sectorial associations and of the unions of agricultural circles and organizations and unions of agricultural sectorial associations; the national congress shall also adopt changes in the statute.

2. In case of the adoption of the change or of a new statute, up to the time of their registration the hitherto existing statute shall be in force.

3. The statute of the central union should define in particular:

- 1) aims and tasks of the central union;
- 2) detailed principles, scope and mode of its activity;
- 3) rights and duties of membership organizations;
- 4) method of setting up membership fees;
- 5) organs of the central union, procedure and principles of their election, period of tenure, powers, mode of activity, and removal of members of these organs before lapse of tenure;
- 6) conditions of adoption and validity of resolutions of organs of the central union;
- 7) manner of representing the central union on the outside and entering by this union into financial obligations;
- 8) assets and funds of the central union and principles of managing these assets and funds;
- 9) manner of changing the statute.

Art 33

The central union forms a legal corporation.

Art 34

1. The central union is also an inspection organ of the agricultural circles and agricultural sectorial associations, as well as of unions of agricultural circles and organizations and unions of agricultural sectorial associations.
2. In performance of the tasks resulting from the provision of Para 1 (sic), the central union is entitled to carry out inspection of the organizations mentioned in this provision; the inspection includes investigation of all kinds of the activity of these organizations in respect of their conformity with law and statutes, legality, purposefulness and efficient management.
3. On the basis of the results of inspection, the central union is entitled to put forward binding proposals and post-inspection recommendations.
4. The results of inspection are reviewed by the next general meeting (congress) after the inspection of the given organization. The central union, as a result of the performed inspection, may order convocation of an extraordinary general meeting (congress).
5. The statutorily appropriate organ of the central union defines the principles, scope and manner of the performance of inspection, the obligations of organizations mentioned in Para 1 connected with inspection, and the course of carrying out the post-inspection proposals and recommendations, as well as appeals against these proposals and recommendations.
6. The organ mentioned in Para 5 may empower definite voivodship unions of agricultural circles and organizations and national unions of agricultural sectorial associations to perform, on behalf of the central union, the inspection of definite organizations of the agricultural self-government.

Chapter VIII

Organs That Register Organizations of Agricultural Self-Government

Art 35

1. The organs competent to register agricultural circles, agricultural sectorial associations, unions of agricultural circles and organizations, and unions of agricultural sectorial associations are the regional courts pertinent to the seat of the given organization of rural self-government.
2. The competent organ to register the statute of the central union is the regional court pertinent to the seat of this union.

Art 36

1. The courts mentioned in Art 35 keep the register of agricultural circles, agricultural sectorial associations, unions of agricultural circles and organizations, and unions of agricultural sectorial associations; in this register is also registered the statute of the central union.

2. The register mentioned in Para 1 is open and accessible to third parties; any interested party is entitled to obtain certified copies and extracts from this register.

Art 37

1. In the registration proceedings are applicable correspondingly the provisions of the code of civil proceedings concerning the nonlitigious proceedings.

2. The Minister of Justice, by an executive order, shall define the principles of keeping the register, data that are to be registered, requirements to be met by a proposal to perform a registration, or organizations mentioned in Art 35 and of their statutes, as well as the principles regulating accessibility of the register to inspection by interested parties.

Chapter IX

Modifications in Provisions in Force, and Introductory, Transitory and Final Provisions

Art 38

The following changes are being introduced in Art 8 of the law on land tax of 26 October 1971 (Dz U of 1971, No 27, poz 254 and of 1974, No 38 poz 230):

a) Para 2 shall be read:

"2. Financial means of the Agricultural Development Fund coming from tax revenues, specified in Para 1, from:

"1) owners (possessors) of individual farms, are at the disposal of agricultural circles and their unions,

"2) agricultural producer cooperatives and members of specialized cooperatives are at the disposal of organizational units associated in the central union of agricultural specialized cooperatives."

b) the following is added to Para 3:

"3. The Council of Ministers, in concert with the Central Union of Agricultural Circles and Organizations and the Central Union of Agricultural Producer Cooperatives, shall determine procedure of transfer to organizations mentioned in Para 2 of financial means of the Agricultural Development Fund, and the purposes for which these means can be allocated."

Art 39

1. The Central Union of Agricultural Circles, as from the date of the coming into force of the law, becomes the Central Union of Agricultural Circles and Organizations within the meaning of the present law.
2. Within a period of time not longer than 1 year from the date of coming into force of the law, the central union shall convene a national congress of delegates of agricultural circles and unions of agricultural circles and organizations and unions of agricultural sectorial associations, which shall adopt the statute of the central union and shall elect its organs.
3. Up to the time of the registration of the statute mentioned in Para 2, the central union shall act on the basis of the heretofore existing statute; until that time, too, its present organs shall function.

Art 40

1. The agricultural circles and agricultural sectorial associations, as well as the gmina and voivodship unions of agricultural circles and unions of agricultural sectorial associations, functioning on the day of coming into force of the law, shall adjust their statutes to the requirements established in the law and shall apply to the pertinent regional court for the registration of the given organization and its statute, not later than within 6 months from the date of coming into force of the law.
2. The registering organ, in entering the given organization of agricultural self-government and its statute into the register, shall direct the removal of this organization from the register of associations.

Art 41

The law shall come into force on the date of

1015

CSO: 2600/171

ROMANIA

WISDOM OF SOLUTION OF MINORITY PROBLEM HAILED

Bucharest CONTEMPORANUL in Romanian 29 Apr 81 p 3

[Article by Elena Florea: "A Defining Characteristic of Revolutionary Humanism: The Minority Policy"]

[Text] On its 60th anniversary, the Romanian Communist Party comes forward with a great number of achievements of historical importance obtained in the struggle and work to build a new society. One of the significant successes of the policy of our party and state is, as emphasized at our party's 12th Congress, the just solution of the minority problem in the spirit of the party's revolutionary view and the provision of certain equal working and living conditions for all the citizens of the country, regardless of their nationality.

The first and most significant of the achievements of historical importance of the Romanian Communist Party's policy is the disestablishment of the exploiting classes regardless of nationality, the creation of socialist property, the creation and development of socialist relations in production, distribution and trade, and the establishment of the unique principle of payment of salary according to the quantity and quality of work performed, without any type of discrimination. In this way, all workers acquire the same position regarding the means of production and the product of their work, thus creating the economic-social basis for equality. On this basis, the solution to the minority problem was brought about by the elimination of any type of social and national exploitation and by the creation of certain new social and national relations based on equality, cooperation and equity.

At the national-political level, all political power was acquired by the working class, in alliance with the peasantry, the intellectuals and the other categories of workers, regardless of their nationality, under the leadership of the Romanian Communist Party. In accordance with this new content of political power in the state, it became possible for the coinhabiting nationalities to be represented in the supreme legislative body of the country, the Grand National Assembly, in the central and local organs of state power, in party organs and in the system of political-civic organizations.

Legal and constitutional regulations are also organically integrated into the policy of resolving the minority problem. In the Constitution and in other laws, there are important provisions which establish citizens' rights and freedoms and prohibit and punish race hatred and discrimination on the basis of sex, religion and nationality. They also contain provisions regarding the guarantee of specific rights to the coinhabiting nationalities, the creation of conditions for using maternal languages, education, cultural institutions, the media and publications, cultural-artistic and creative activities, and so forth, all in the maternal languages.

New forms of administrative-territorial organization were adopted, depending upon the specific nature of each stage of development in the country, with the current administrative-territorial organization providing even better conditions to bring about equality.

An especially important intrinsic facet of the policy for resolving the minority problem is the cultural-spiritual development of the coinhabiting nationalities. Under this aspect, there are achievements of historical importance, such as the elimination of illiteracy for those 35 percent in the total population who were not educated, regardless of their nationality; the reform, reorganization and modernization of education, including the education in the languages of the coinhabiting nationalities; the development of national cultures and the spread of these cultures among the masses, including the cultures of the languages of the nationalities; the improvement of the level of culture and knowledge of all types of citizens; and, the affirmation of a new type of human personality.

Of overwhelming importance in providing a material base necessary to resolving the minority problem is the development of the national economy, the carrying out of industrialization and the modernization of agriculture throughout the country and at the level of each county. The general economic progress and development of all the regions and localities throughout the country are an essential condition for the full affirmation of coinhabiting nationalities, ensuring the necessary material conditions so they can benefit from the rights and freedoms outlined and guaranteed in the Constitution and in other laws and so they can have equality, first of all in the area of living and working conditions. The national economy, through its dynamic nature being capable of creating new jobs in different fields and all regions of the country, offers the material base within which the right to work can be exercised. This is a significant achievement if we keep in mind that today there are countries in the world with a much higher level of economic-industrial development than our country that are faced with massive unemployment, which affects the "national minorities," young people and women, as certain scientific works in these countries have pointed out.

At the same time, the development of the those counties that have remained behind creates the opportunities for them to employ their work force, which permits the coinhabiting nationalities to enjoy these jobs right in their

county of residence. Meanwhile, in many industrially developed capitalist countries faced with economic imbalances within their countries, we find what some analysts in these countries call "the phenomenon of evacuation," constituting a massive exodus of workers towards the developed regions of the country and the emptying of the backwards regions. In the case of our country, the ever greater opportunities that the counties involved in accelerated economic development have to employ their own workers in their own region allow us to preserve the demographic balance and permit an increase in population by natural means and a planned distribution of the work force. At the same time, we have demonstrated the foundless basis of certain views according to which the industrialization of Romania is being carried out with the undeclared purpose of dislodging the minorities from their native regions. In reality, the rational distribution of the forces of production throughout the entire country and the balanced development of the entire national economy ensure that industrialization will be a factor for progress and civilization, both for the Romanian people and for the coinhabiting nationalities.

The economic strength of our country also permits the growth of national income - a condition for achieving the fundamental objective of raising the standard of living for all those who work, regardless of nationality. Under these conditions, Romanians, Hungarians, Germans, Serbs and all nationalities, all those who work and live in socialist Romania have the opportunity to permanently work and permanently earn a living, without being affected by partial or complete unemployment for the short or long term; to maintain their health and to rest; and, to improve their culture and education. They are protected against galloping prices and inflation, from the blight resulting from a housing crisis, from prices that make vacations, cure holidays and health care inaccessible, from the commercialization of their culture and its transformation into a luxury item and so forth.

Under conditions where, in numerous developed countries in the world, education, culture and art are becoming less accessible to broad categories of workers, even though they proclaim "the equality of chances and opportunities," in our country this equality finds its concrete expression in the development of the material base of culture and art, in new cultural institutions and locations, in the development and modernization of education at all grades, including the education in the languages of the coinhabiting nationalities, and in the carrying out of sustained publication activities, with the nationalities benefitting from a media and publication in their own language, as well as radio and television broadcasts in their maternal languages.

All this are the incontestable realities which demonstrate that the Romanian Communist Party, by giving expression to its high responsibilities to all the people, is carrying out its fundamental obligation by consistently bringing about full equality and by ensuring the development of the coinhabiting nationalities and the unity and brotherhood of all workers in their creative struggle and work directed towards the prosperity of our common country.

8724
CSO: 2700

QUALITY, EFFICIENCY OF LABOR FORCE DISCUSSED

Bucharest ERA SOCIALISTA in Romanian No 5, 5 Mar 81 pp 12-15

[Article by Dr Ion Pacararu: "Quality and Effectiveness of Social Labor"]

[Text] In Romania's present stage, now that the technical-material base of socialism has been created and we have a considerable highly skilled manpower potential, the emphasis in production development is shifting more and more toward the intensive, qualitative factors such as greater labor productivity and better use of all material, financial and manpower resources through application of the advances of the technical-scientific revolution, in a word toward full exploitation of the factors that together enhance the effectiveness of social production as a whole. Effectiveness is an important point in the party's economic strategy and ultimately the main means of accomplishing the purpose of socialist production, namely the welfare of all. As it says in the Directives of the 12th RCP Congress on Romania's Socioeconomic Development in the 1981-1985 Period and Long-Range Objectives up to 1990, the next five-year plan will further emphasize growth of economic effectiveness in all sectors of the national economy, the qualitative aspects of all socioeconomic activity, and the most productive use of all society's resources."

Since all outlays contributing to creation of the social product are ultimately outlays of live labor in various stages of the reproduction process, we must consider more effective production primarily from the standpoint of productivity and regard growth of social labor productivity as a general material process including both live and materialized labor.

In view of the critical role of live labor or the labor force as the main productive force of society as well as the importance of greater labor productivity to obtaining the greatest possible effectiveness, it is clear that the rates of socioeconomic development and the success of the great aims of the RCP Program depend upon labor organization, use of equipment, and improvement of occupational skills. In the last five-year plan enhancement of the national economic potential through rational and effective use of the labor force was vital to the successful solution of a wide range of economic, political and social problems of socialist construction.

A very high degree of employment of the labor resources has been attained. Due to the reduction of the natural growth of the employable population because of some past phenomena, new conditions have been created and certain difficulties arise in supplying the enterprises with manpower, complicating the tasks of optimal distribution of

the gain in the employable population between the sectors of material production and the rapidly growing nonproductive sectors. Greater difficulties are expected in meeting the personnel requirement for such trades and occupations as construction, mining, ferrous metallurgy, drilling etc. and also for such industrial centers as Timisoara, Brasov, Bucharest, Sibiu, Constanta etc.

Since further reduction of the proportion of the young rural population in the total employable agricultural population can interfere with use of agricultural equipment, aggravate production losses, and involve more of the urban labor force in agricultural operations, especially harvesting, it is vital to approach the problem of releasing manpower from agriculture in the future and diverting it to other sectors more carefully, and differently for each and every community. Meanwhile firmer measures are needed in the counties with surplus manpower to help provide the new economic capacities to be built there with local manpower. In general the intercounty migration of the labor force will be considerably reduced in both volume and directions, so that it is very important to rationalize it under the new conditions.

Under the present circumstances the national economy is to be developed with no undue increase in the number of workers employed in material production but rather by a pronounced increase in social labor productivity as specified in the Directives of the 12th Party Congress. "The efforts will be concentrated on a more pronounced gain in social labor productivity, and about 80 percent of the national income is to be produced thereby. Throughout industry labor productivity computed on the basis of net output is to be increased at an average annual rate of 7.0-7.5 percent, and one of 5.4-6.2 percent in construction-installation." Since the growing number of employees while the socialist economy was being created largely compensated for the shortage of other production factors, especially technical equipment, now the economic necessity of greater effectiveness objectively requires production methods that will conserve live labor through better use of the existing equipment, technology and labor force.

Rational and effective use of the labor force is a many-sided, highly complex process, and it depends to a great extent on the measures that are taken in other fields, such as placement of production, allocation and structure of investments, promotion of technical-scientific progress, working conditions, social measures etc. Changes in the formation, structure and use of the labor force usually occur later than the socioeconomic processes that cause them. Therefore if the problem arises of a change in trend in the use of the labor force, and we feel the problem arises as an objective necessity, provision for it must be made today, and therefore we must also change the planning methods. Accordingly I think the main planning objective now is to regard the factor of "labor resources" as the controlling one in choosing the aims and purpose of development as well as the means of accomplishing them.

Considerable reduction of underproductive manual labor is one of the main ways of securing high rates of economic development with declining growth rates of labor resources. This requires special attention to the labor inputs in transport operations, loading-unloading, storage and other auxiliary and service operations. Remember that mechanization and automation of laborious and injurious operations are vital not only to growth of labor productivity but also to further stabilization of personnel and more extensive recruitment of youth for those jobs. It is not without significance that the Uniform National Plan assigns specific tasks for curtailing manual labor, broken down by ministries, industrial centrals and enterprises.

Much effort is required to improve the organization of production, labor and management and to appreciably curtail losses of working time and instability of personnel. As a matter of fact, in setting the plan tasks for enhancing labor productivity it would be desirable to considerably augment the role and importance of the organizing factors as essential means of conserving live labor and rationalizing production. Experience has made it abundantly clear that if organization of production and labor remains defective, application of the latest scientific-technical advances does not produce the expected results. But at a given level of technical equipment and when order has been established in organization of production and labor, use of the labor force can be considerably improved. It is no secret that without order and organization declining labor discipline and greater personnel instability are inevitable.

Certainly improved labor organization primarily depends upon regularity of production throughout the working day, week, month and year, strengthened technological discipline, reduced losses of working time, and normally intensive labor. In general this improvement requires no investments, considerably increases labor productivity, heightens people's interest in their work, and creates pleasant working conditions for them. Collective forms of organization and remuneration of labor are important in this respect, and especially the overall contract system, which permits more extensive servicing, multiquification, greater volume of operations with fewer workers, and fewer interruptions and stoppages in production. The time has come to begin general and regular improvement of labor organization in enterprises as well as wide-scale introduction of standard plans for labor organization not only in certain work places but also in brigades, shops, sections and entire enterprises. This will permit complete solution of labor organization problems for whole categories of personnel.

Strengthened order and discipline on all jobs have proved indispensable to rational use of working time and an important factor for greater efficiency of live labor. They can be achieved by further improvement in setting the work norms and by individual and collective photographing of the working day to detect and eliminate the causes of stoppages and interruptions. We still have a very great many absences, delays, interruptions and stoppages in production, with annual losses of millions of days in which an output of billions of lei could have been produced.

Unsatisfactory operation of public transportation means causes great losses of working time. In quite a few cases the work schedules of institutions and trade and service units are not coordinated with those of the productive units, so that much working time is lost. Contrary to the party's directions, at a number of points workers are used to carry out public tasks or mass actions during working hours. Firm measures are required to remedy these situations, to improve the schedules of the social-cultural and trade units (creches, kindergartens, polyclinics etc.), and to coordinate them with the beginning and end of the productive units' schedules.

We feel a particular need to discuss the problem of personnel stability, which has declined in recent years thanks to the higher technical level of production, better working and housing conditions, and the measures to encourage personnel stability. Yet the level of instability is still quite high in industry and especially in the construction-installation enterprises, where more workers have left worksites than have been hired. Unorganized transfers from one job to another for various reasons, but especially because of unsatisfactory working conditions or atmosphere or defective labor organization, cause losses of many working days, disorganize production, impair productivity and often lead to changes of occupation, extra outlays for retraining etc.

Quite a few enterprises do not pay enough attention to creating conditions essential to stabilizing personnel and often overlook the social factors that can unfavorably affect labor productivity. Unfortunately there is still a tendency to maintain a larger number of workers in order to compensate for the existing defects in labor organization and to cope with the production tasks. When greater labor productivity is essential to more effective social production it becomes highly important to actively seek ways of using the existing labor force more economically in every work place, shop, section and factory and to release and reassign surplus personnel in an organized fashion.

It can be said without exaggeration that in the present period the quality of the labor force is the most important factor for high productivity of social labor, greater general effectiveness, and transition to a new quality in all economic and social activities. Construction of a modern society based on the latest advances of science and progress requires highly skilled and competent people who can activate the entire socioeconomic mechanism and produce growing quantities of material and cultural values of increasingly high quality.

Realizing this fact, the RCP has been emphasizing occupational training and improvement of workers for all fields of activity, intensified instruction and qualification, and modernization and development of the functions of the labor force. Moreover the results obtained in training the labor force during the years of socialist construction are graphic evidence of the RCP's constant effort to make society's main productive force contribute as much as possible to the development of Romanian society.

When we consider the fact that greater labor productivity and effectiveness are an essential consideration governing Romania's immediate and long-range economic development and that they are inconceivable without rational use of the labor force, the problem of occupational training and improvement acquires new meanings and a particular importance. As our party secretary general pointed out, "It goes without saying that implementation of all the provisions in the Directives depends upon the activity of the cadres and men, our working class, the peasantry and intelligentsia, all workers regardless of nationality, and our people as a whole... We must emphasize training of cadres of workers and specialists and better occupational training of the cooperative farmers and farmers in general. Meanwhile we must firmly carry out the decision on further improvement of the awareness of all personnel from the Central Committee and the Executive Political Committee down to the last worker."

Under these circumstances occupational training and improved technical and general cultural training of all workers in keeping with the requirements of Romania's socioeconomic development and of technical-scientific progress are the main objectives of Romania's socioeconomic development in the present decade. The Directives of the 12th Party Congress call for occupational training of more than 2.7 million persons, including about 2.45 million skilled workers, 55,000 experts and over 120,000 personnel with higher education, in the 1981-1985 period to meet the personnel requirement (natural gain and losses). Therefore major quantitative and especially qualitative changes will be made in the manpower training structure. The proportion of skilled workers in the total workers will reach about 90 percent and over 95 percent in the peak sectors of industry. Emphasis will be placed on training skilled workers in the basic trades for machine building, the metallurgical, mining, petroleum, chemical and construction materials industries and construction-installation, and in the agricultural trades. Over one-third of the total workers to be trained will be skilled in such trades as cutting processor, fitter, mechanic, miner, petroleum

worker, steelworker, blast-furnace worker, driver, structure builder etc. in this period. In future years education on all levels will be further improved by ever closer integration with research and production and will play a growing role in training personnel essential to the national economy, so that it will best meet the demands of technical progress and modern production as well as the requirements for rapid development of the technical-material base and superstructure of society.

All these measures that have been outlined here and the vast efforts that will be made to train and improve the labor force are indicative of the importance of this problem at present and especially in the future. The intensive progress of science and technology will radically change the nature and content of the labor of the worker and the specialist. The skilled worker's labor will become more and more of a variant of technical-engineering work as new forms of interdependence between man and machine, new conditions and a new structure of productive activity are created that will considerably lessen the differences between physical and intellectual work. The changes that will be made in the production structure and the changed forms and methods of organization due to wide-scale application of the new technologies will entail essential changes in the training of workers and the other operatives in material production as well as changes in the relations between the various groups of occupations, strengthening the trend toward training the versatile worker for the benefit of both the individual, for his complete fulfillment, and of society as well.

Of course overall mechanization and automation of production and development of the technical inventory radically change the nature and content of the worker's labor, gradually shifting the emphasis from physical, muscular efforts to intellectual activity with a high proportion of creative elements, and the structure of the worker's functions is changed accordingly. The operational functions consisting of transformation of the object of labor, and especially those dependent upon physical effort and simpler and monotonous activity, are gradually shifted to the machines and replaced by control, regulation and observation of the technological process.

Since technical-scientific progress usually involves the use of more complex equipment, the volume of work on regulating, repairing and servicing the equipment is considerably greater. Maintenance of equipment in operating condition and its use to full capacity very heavily depend upon the qualifications of the repairmen. The labor of that category of workers is becoming increasingly intellectual and demands sound and comprehensive knowledge as well as great occupational skills on their part. Activity in connection with control of highly complex technological equipment or processes is becoming more and more like technical-engineering work in its content, since the latter is characterized by the functions of calculation, observation, regulation and control of the technological process. On the highest levels of automation, where the workers' functions are confined to observation of the control panel and the automated system, there is generally no objective reason for including the respective workers in either the category of workers or that of technical-engineering personnel, since the distinction between those categories is erased. Workers and technical-engineering personnel will also become increasingly alike as the operational functions are transferred to machines and equipment is developed that practically eliminates the worker's labor in various stages of the technological cycle.

But the demands on personnel training in the present period are occasioned not only by the production equipment the workers are to use but also by their participation in production management and planning in Romanian socialist society, so that a purely technical instruction proves inadequate. Occupational training must be based

increasingly on the consideration that in Romania today a superior and well-rounded training is no longer just a means to mastery of the modern productive forces but also a necessity for performing any creative activity. This requires more emphasis upon the political-ideological and economic education that will facilitate the workers' understanding of the laws and motive forces of social development as well as their active and efficient participation in economic and social management. The party requires us to train a skilled individual while forming his consciousness of his responsibility for the development of socialist society. In the course of personnel training we must instill the revolutionary spirit, devotion to the socialist nation, discipline, organization, the collectivist spirit and the trend toward a broad vocational outlook that can discover the interrelations of phenomena and stimulate creative initiative.

When there is a very dynamic technical base and the means and objects of labor and the production technology are affected by technical-scientific advances, theoretical and practical knowledge must be refreshed and new working skills must be acquired or, in other words, qualifications must be constantly improved. Actually, general change in the material elements of production, change in the machine inventory, improved technology and labor organization, use of new kinds of raw materials and materials, etc. change the nature of the functions of labor and require new knowledge and skills in keeping with the qualitative state of these elements. Acquisition of new, supplementary theoretical and practical knowledge through study and instruction is the concrete expression of such an improvement in qualifications.

The RCP closely associates accomplishment of the strategic objectives of Romania's general progress and of more effective social production especially with improved personnel training. It accordingly becomes most urgent to thoroughly analyze our manpower training potential and the extent to which it meets the new developmental requirements in order to determine exactly what must be done in this respect. I also consider it necessary to critically evaluate the present methods of personnel training and improvement to see whether or not they meet the demands of technical-scientific progress. Such analyses are particularly necessary because the nature of the changes and the qualifications demanded of personnel under the present technical-scientific revolution have been reflected only to a rather limited extent in the Romanian technical literature. Nor do I think the problems in connection with the changes in the social structure and with the qualification of the labor resources in Romania have been adequately analyzed, although "in general" we have the necessary data.

But a number of practical problems, so to speak, remain unsolved. For instance, the training plans have been fulfilled on the whole, but many enterprises, the newly built ones especially, are not provided with manpower in the necessary qualification structure. This contributes to failure to meet the planned activation deadlines and failure to attain the technical-economic parameters within the time limits. More careful study of the workers' occupational qualification structure reveals that about two-thirds of the total skilled workers were trained in enterprises, in short-term courses or by experience on the job. And in this decade too those training methods will play an important part in workers training. The adult population changing jobs, especially those shifting from agriculture to industry and construction, are trained in this way, retraining in other trades is provided for, etc. The recent development of multiple professions and acquisition of a second trade by many workers also encourages extensive maintenance of this form of occupational training.

Nevertheless we must recognize that maintenance of this method of worker training in its present form is in a sense an obstacle to development of the productive forces, since it does not provide the necessary professional quality. The main reasons are the rather short time in which the workers are trained, their inadequate study of the theoretical disciplines, etc. By these methods workers usually acquire a restricted knowledge of their trades, so that they have to be retrained even in case of minor changes in equipment and technologies. Narrowness of their occupational training also has the further disadvantage of causing unwarranted increases in auxiliary and service personnel. For example, a turner trained in qualification courses and directly participating in the production process uses the services of at least five other highly skilled workers, namely an expert, a mechanic, a fitter, an electrician and a setter, and since the latter are employed, he interrupts production when any defect occurs in his lathe. What is more, not even the present methods of improving workers occupational training can remedy matters in the meantime.

Study of the workers qualification structure also indicates that in a great many enterprises, especially those activated in the last 5 years, there are shortages, sometimes acute, of the higher brackets of qualification while the lesser ones show considerable surpluses. It can also be said without fear of error that by and large all Romanian industry shows a certain lag in the level of workers qualification behind the entirety of existing operations, with all its consequences for the quality of the operations performed and for the level of labor productivity.

These are a few questions which I wanted to raise and which can be successfully resolved by active and productive collaboration of all those interested and involved in the field of personnel training and improvement. In that way society's main productive force, the labor force, will be more effectively used and the great socioeconomic tasks assigned the people by the RCP for this five-year plan will be accomplished.

5186

CSO: 2700/216

DEFICIENCIES OF LITERARY CRITICISM ANALYZED

Bucharest ERA SOCIALISTA in Romanian No 5, 5 Mar 61 pp 24-26

[Article by Ion Dodu Balan: "Literary Criticism As an Ideological Dimension of Culture"]

[Text] Literary criticism in particular and criticism of art in general (but to a much lesser extent) are again in the center of discussions in the press, on the radio and TV, in the specialized scientific research institutes, and in the subject departments in higher education. In recognition of its social importance, its formative role of aesthetic and ideological education of the masses of readers, and its contribution to the discovery and promotion of talents, to guidance of public taste, and to the formation of a scientific conception of the world and life, criticism is being discussed more heatedly than ever in the widest ranks of lovers of art and literature. Especially since the welcome and interesting discussion initiated by the daily SCINTILA and shared, up to the present writing, by Serban Cioculescu ("Suiting the Comments to the Subject As an Elementary Norm"), Pompiliu Marcea ("What Options Guide the Critic's Selection?"), G. Dimisiam ("The Value Judgment As the Purpose of the Analytic Approach"), George Munteanu ("Prestige of the New Syntheses"), Valeriu Rapcanu ("Fertile Dialogue with the Idea Content of the Work"), Mircea Iorgulescu ("Substitutes' for the Value Judgment"), Zoe Dumitrescu-Busulenga ("Respect for the Arguments As the Sign of Real Maturity"), Al. Piru ("Climate of Responsibility"), Paul Anghel ("Objectivity and Fluctuations of the Value Judgment"), Ion Dodu Balan ("Competence and Fidelity of the Act of Criticism"), Eugen Simion ("A New 'Torrent of Words'?"), Al. Balaci ("The Ethical, Formative Purpose of Literature"), and Ion Carcasu ("The Integrating Philosophical View"), I might say that their consideration of two standards, the professional and the ethical, has lent the discussions of criticism a welcome breadth that bears witness once again to the importance of this discipline as part of our culture.

By expressing a wide variety of tastes and opinions, these "colloquia" and other discussions in the literary press (to which I could have wished renowned critics like Constantin Ciopraga, Mircea Zăciu, Ov. S. Grohvalniceanu, N. Balota, R. Munteanu or Ion Ianosî to contribute their experience) have also attracted in salutary fashion the equally varied and interesting opinions of some enthusiastic and competent readers. And finally, the discussion of criticism, when well organized in an atmosphere of true freedom and democracy, is actually a dialogue, a spirited, engrossing colloquium and no monotonous monologue or dialogue of the deaf, which has occurred

more than once. But for its greater effectiveness, I would suggest that future discussions in the daily or literary press be more specific and refer more directly to authors, works and publishing houses, to the attitudes taken by subject journals, and to the right or wrong opinions of writers or critics whether they are plainly stated or merely implied.

I feel an even wider participation of writers of all generations and readers of the most diverse social strata would also be welcome. Romanian-speaking readers could be better informed as to what is going on in Romanian criticism written in Hungarian, German and Serbian. Such an exchange of experience would be really productive and would contribute to a sounder knowledge of current Romanian literature, its directions of development, and its significant values.

Of course the discussion is continuing and all these points can be taken up as well as many others, especially if the discussion is extended to include criticism of fine arts, music and drama, which seems normal to us. Meanwhile SCINTEIA, ROMANIA LIBERA, CONTEMPORANUL and the radio have been holding such discussions, which is indicative of seriousness in the general approach to the problems of literary and artistic criticism. I thought the talented director Horea Popescu's comments in SCINTEIA were noteworthy, intelligent and fraught with ideas.

Of all the comments in the daily SCINTEIA, in the other journals or on the radio, the most outstanding was the idea that we now have an impressive corps of good, talented and well-trained critics who analyze, most often with competence and feeling, the current literary phenomenon according to its artistic nature and its role in society.

We have a literary criticism with a broad cultural outlook and a flexible scope, free of proletkultist dogmas but not always of aestheticizing dogmas as well. It is a constantly developing scientific criticism gaining real prestige among specialists and the reading public and a receptive, enterprising criticism capable of designing a new culture. It is a dynamic criticism applied with acuity to the nature of the artistic creation but not invariably also with an adequate integrating power or any plain concern for the content and message of the analyzed work. And it is a Marxist criticism, open to the most interesting advances in that field but without overlooking the results of phenomenological criticism, of the "new criticism" illustrated by a Jean Pierre Richard, Charles Mauron, Georges Poulet, Roland Barthes et al, or of the structuralist, psychoanalytic, existentialist, archetypal, semiotic, stylistic and other forms of criticism.

But contact with such schools of criticism must not lead us to mechanical acceptance, as it often happens, of any theories that exclude historical determinism or divorce the existence of the character in literature from any social-historical determination by opposing him to society itself, theories that present the artistic creation as a mere expression of a frequently pathological subconscious, as a succession of obsessions or as a mere automatic dictation from the depths in man. Scientific criticism must be in a continuing dialogue with other critical systems, comparing itself with them, opposing them when necessary, objectively weighing their theoretical contributions, and confirming their truths. Mechanical, fruitless and servile transplanting from one ideological milieu to another is unacceptable to Marxist criticism. Uncritical and uncreative borrowings are clearly harmful to the critic's originality, to his ideological position, and to the orientation of Romanian socialist-humanist literature. Out of more or less honest borrowings we can make no intellectual capital of our own to lend us authority or inspire us.

In criticism we must be ourselves, assert our Marxist viewpoint, and exploit our national experience because, as Alexandru Balaci wrote in SCINTEIA, "Any creative personality is deeply rooted in the historical soil of his own nation and his own social and intellectual environment to which he organically belongs. Despite their distinct personalities, the creators of literature belong to an ideological and cultural background and share in a general intellectual heritage. Even if the work of art is judged from within, as a "product" composed of various components and strata of sounds, meanings and typical characters, the creator's mode of thought, ideology, and ethical and aesthetic purpose cannot be ignored. Concern with the linguistic-formal problems of the work of art that are posed solely by the formalists and structuralists cannot exist alone... A theory to the effect that there are only relations of expression between literary works and systems cannot be rationally accepted. The background and content cannot be ignored even when the form and art of language are being judged. The idea content and the ideological connection of works of art cannot be ignored. The mode of thought, ideology and ethical purpose forming literature cannot be sacrificed to a formalist-expressionist problem. This problematic dilemma between "contentists" and "formalists" cannot in any case overlook reality, history and the connection between the literary and the social." (SCINTEIA No 11946 18 January 1981)

In Ion Carcasu's opinion expressed in the same issue of SCINTEIA, these very real defects, present in our criticism too, can be corrected "by the approach of Marxist criticism, which bases the method on the possibility of knowing the objective truth and on the idea of integrating the work or text in the general process of knowing the world and modifying it in practice. The progress of the new methods of critical prospecting would then come to prolong the progress shown by the Marxist theory of knowledge, itself in full course of renovation and reportioning. The present stage is one of expectation. The euphoria of the first victorious assaults upon the "antiquated redoubt" of traditional criticism were followed by doubts that arose even in the new schools of criticism that are trying to propose remedies. For the "new critics" lack an integrating philosophical view to correlate the method and the spirit of scientific, lexical precision with the profound truths of human knowledge."

A similar opinion was expressed by G. Dimisianu in SCINTEIA No 11912, 7 December 1980, plainly departing from the autonomist positions in evaluating the development of literature and asking the critics to reinforce their historical viewpoint by "clear, fully substantiated reassertion, openly polemic if necessary, of the conception that considers the expressions of culture in their inseparable relationship with the forms of material existence, with the social and with history. Criticism still has a great struggle with its own limitations and inertia, with "the too technical and limited descriptive viewpoint of many articles," with the "persistence of others in an anachronistic, and especially, ineffectual autonomism because of the illusory attempt to isolate the aesthetic from other elements composing the reality of the creation," with "insufficient emphasis on the message of the work," and in general the "still too timid attempts to pursue literature in the entire depth of its philosophical and political-social implications." To these professional shortcomings I would add others of an ethical nature, like the tribute paid by some to the group spirit, excessive subjectivism, prejudices, confusion of the author with the work, etc.

Therefore we must constantly assert an impeccable ethic in the act of criticism, as well as Marxist philosophy's great power to creatively integrate all the data of the modern sciences and research concerning man (psychology, sociology, linguistics, some results of psychoanalysis and structuralism, etc.) and also its power to reject

eclecticism and to militate with revolutionary intransigence against idealism and backward thinking. Marxism expects consistency and firmness of literary criticism, not bending with the wind. As one intelligent writer said, a confused guide is nothing but a lost comrade. Marxist criticism requires great moral probity, sincere and boundless love of worthy creation, and intolerance of nonvalues, makeshifts and superficiality. But as the literary critic and historian Al. Piru maintained, "Criticism is primarily assertion and only secondarily negation. It means to recognize and determine values and only then to reject valueless and imposture. The intellectual climate in which we live favors positive, comprehensive and responsible critical action from which incompetence and superficiality alone are excluded."

Marxist criticism can be neither negativistic nor apologetic. It must always consist of a frank discussion of man and the great problems of existence that enter sometimes brilliantly and sometimes tragically into the biography of the actual man, in the flesh and bones, historically and socially determined. I mention this necessity with the feeling that it is often overlooked and that we often pay too great a tribute to formalism.

Sometimes in confrontations on the universal level we repeat commonplace truths without exploiting the inner reserves of Marxist philosophy and, whether we like it or not, we leave to the existentialist, psychoanalytic, archetypal or other kinds of critics the privilege of intensive investigation of essential problems of life and of the man of today. When we too readily resort to technicism, strictly formal problems, professional snobbery, petty, unprincipled polemics, trifling and "pilfering" we deprive ourselves of this fine opportunity that opens up a broad field for critical investigation. No one can speak more new and essential truths about literature and art, about their relations with reality, or about man and his relations with society than the true Marxist critic. Therefore the Marxist critic has to be thoroughly and directly knowledgeable about contemporary society and the soul of the new man. In conveying his impressions of literature to the reading public, he also verifies his tastes and judgments by comparing them with the latter's opinions. That is why I consider the reader's participation in the discussion in SCIENTIA so salutary, which participation must be greatly expanded and encouraged for the benefit of the practice of literary criticism.

There is nothing more futile than the effort to arbitrarily impose creations and tastes of no value. I cannot proclaim the modest beginner X a genius when he is only a miserable imitator or, even worse, a plagiarizer just because I take a certain interest in him. Est modus in rebus. And we must maintain that measure, namely good critical taste, under any circumstances. Eugen Simion also pleads for a measure in his remarks, accusing some reviewers of "immoderate language" and an "orgy of superlatives, replacing aesthetic justification with laudatory prose." In a lively and flexible style, with useful observations, the critic brings out a serious discrepancy in the immoderate comment on the published books. "I read and cannot believe what I see: The reviewer conveys the impression that he is experiencing a masterpiece and only a masterpiece and that he is breathing the air of intellectual peaks and only of peaks... I wonder whether the literary reviewer has lost his wits or his elementary moral honesty."

Sometimes these defects, which occur throughout literary and art criticism openly or in disguise even in the case of those who criticize them in others, are possible because some critics are the legitimate holders of columns in various dailies and journals seemingly for life, and this gives them a feeling of immunity. It is quite

right to stigmatize "some critics' proprietary attitude," an "outmoded phenomenon" that gives rise, as it was said in the discussions, to many abuses beginning with imposition of personal taste "and from there to recruitment of obedient disciples and institution of hegemonic attitudes and practices, and reaching the point of boycotting or compromising those with other opinions." While noteworthy and honest books pass unnoticed, the attempt is made to attract attention to mediocre books. But understand me, the presence of serious regular columns in a journal is an act of culture and cannot be rejected out of hand.

As we know, the great Romanian critics distinguished themselves in one publication or another by objectivity, honesty, a sound and rich culture, concern for the fate of the national literature, respect for the public and the desire to educate them and provide them with a good intellectual pabulum. Thus they started schools and literary trends around the journals and circles they conducted on the basis of a clear aesthetic program accompanied by a keen patriotism. In general they were all characterized by impeccable ethical and professional conduct. Let us think of Titu Maiorescu, C. D. Gherea, Nicolae Iorga, Ilarie Chendi, Garabet Ibraileanu, Eugen Lovinescu, Tudor Vianu, George Calinescu, Pompiliu Constantinescu and so many others. But they were human, and sometimes subjectivism played tricks on them when they wanted to promote some paltry scribbler or poet as a writer of merit by criteria other than aesthetic ones. Of course they did not succeed because the great or minor writer is born and cannot be made by a critic. Our literary climate would also be improved if this point were better understood. Unfortunately it is understood with great difficulty and some critics harbor the illusion that they make the writers. Even worse, some writers even believe in such critical "spells" and form "cliques" around the miserable priest.

Other comments, signed by Zoe Dumitrescu-Busulenga, Serban Cioculescu, Valeriu Rapcanu, Paul Anghel, Mircea Iorgulescu and the undersigned, also discuss the same professional and ethical problems of literary criticism, some of them with the advantage of a welcome specific quality, censuring some unacceptable habits like the group spirit, lack of principle, nonprofessionalism, fraud, poor quality and tolerance of sub-literary and paraliterary phenomena, deploring the lack of practical effect of the discussions of criticism in the last 5 or 6 years, and calling serious attention to the great ethical and professional responsibilities of the activists who guide such ideological sectors.

So that the discussion to which we are referring (which is still in full course) may have some definite results, at least for me and the colleagues closest to my activity, permit me to ask myself again, at the risk of repeating myself, how we could make literary criticism more effective, more principled and better, with a much greater role in the evolution of our ideological and intellectual activity? According to the comments read in the press and heard on the radio, I think many other colleagues, critics and writers would subscribe to some answers.

In any discussion of criticism we should begin with a very pragmatic question, not so much what it is, which has been said long ago and too often, but particularly what do we expect of it?

There are many answers but I think a few are essential. First, that we comment on current literature knowledgeably, objectively, honestly and competently. That we say whether a book is good or bad, whether or not it is worth reading, whether it contributes anything new that we have not read before, and specifically what it has

to offer in the way of viewpoint and artistic expression. I also proceed from the fact that the act of criticism is performed on Romanian literature and primarily for the Romanian reader, who has a certain perceptive frame of reference, certain tastes and intellectual needs, and certain ethical and aesthetic ideals, and we must always keep this reader in mind. Otherwise the act of criticism would be utterly futile.

That we interpret the national characteristics of Romanian literature with clear pride and intellectual dignity. That we know other literatures well and respect them but do not bow down before them in servile fashion, as has happened more than once.

Then it is absolutely necessary for us to make use, with more dedication, correctness and professional dignity, of the so rich and ebullient ideological climate favorable to development of the arts, creative personalities, and comparisons of ideas. We must read as many as possible of the published works objectively, and we must compare them *sine ira et studio*, keeping the great values of national and world literature constantly in mind, in order to avoid laudatory style and apologetic or negativistic attitudes. We must state the Marxist ideological position plainly, defending it with skill and resolve. We must avoid the eclecticism we often encounter in the literary press and make no concession to bourgeois ideology. We must not accept the debilitated snobs who impress the naive and half-educated or the sterile professors who want to credit any impostors with novelty. We must make as great an effort to promote a worthy book as its author made to write it. We must avoid literary cliques and see to the unity in diversity of our literary front. We must respect our opinions without blunting the critical spirit or concealing the errors. We must not arrogantly believe that literature exists because criticism or clerks exist. I would say the opposite, but we must not form complexes because of this objective situation, and we must realize that we are all responsible for the scale of values established today in Romanian culture. We must be representatives of public opinion while remaining ourselves and not making any concession to bad taste, ignorance or fraud, and being critics we can also be self-critics. We must not confuse the work with the person (Alec Russo has again advised us to this effect), and we must make every effort to develop Romanian literature and culture in general in keeping with the era in which we live and all our great national traditions. And we must leave to the future, with the efforts and common responsibility of the critics and the creators, the real image of this present, telling the world the truth about ourselves.

5186

CSO: 2700/216

CURRENT LITERARY SCENE REVIEWED BY WRITER

Bucharest FLACARA in Romanian 26 Mar 81 pp 15, 17

[Interview with Mihai Ungeanu by Ilie Purdusa]

[Text] [Question] If I were to ask you to give me one event--or the event--which influenced or changed the face of Romanian writing in recent times, what would your answer be?

[Answer] Positive or negative?

[Question] Positive.

[Answer] Without question, having the party leadership abolish censorship. Too little is said about this act, whose incalculable positive results are being seen and will continue to be seen. Comrade Nicolae Ceausescu understood that the forward steps for Romanian literature required this. However, the new situation also requires a new responsibility from the writers.

[Question] And what would the negative aspect be?

[Answer] Some had asked for the abolishment of censorship as if they were asking for the moon from the skies, knowing that the moon never is given. The freedom to act, however, did not produce the much awaited works immediately but, rather, violent incriminations in the press as if the abolishing of the celebrated institution had no purpose other than to bring out old aversions.

[Question] In your opinion, which are the books of this new climate?

[Answer] Let us refer to the last one and one-half years, approximately in chronological order: Ion Lancranjan's "Fiul Secetei" (Son of the Drought), "Cel Mai Iubit Dintre Paminteni" (The Most Beloved Human Being), "Biblioteca din Alexandria (The Library in Alexandria) by Petre Salcudeanu, "Vocile Noptii" (Voices of the Night) by Augustin Buzura, "Fluviile" (The Streams) by Paul Anghel, "Iepurele Schiop" (The Lamé Rabbit) by D. R. Popescu, "Dragostea si Revolutia" (Love and the Revolution) by Dinu Sararu, "Manifest Pentru Sanatatea Pamintului" (Manifesto for a Healthy Earth) by Adrian Paunescu, "Elegii Politice" (Political Elegies) by Ion Gheorghe and "Iubiti-va pe Tunuri" (Love Your Cannons) again by Paunescu.

[Question] Do you accept the idea of the existence of the newly established literary groups in Romanian literature]

[Answer] An attempt was made in a short article in NEUE ZÜRCHER ZEITUNG, on the basis of some concerned information, to give credit to the information that a "Eugen Barbu group" of obscure purpose had been established in Romanian literature. No matter where it comes from, this kind of information proves a lot of fantasy and, beyond this, bad faith. It attempts to disfigure the appearance of Romanian writers of well-known independence and nonconformity through inventive rallying. Quoted is Adrian Paunescu, who is well known for his many and old disagreements with Eugen Barbu, the well-known novelist. It is all the more illustrative that writers approached in the most unpunctilious manner in SĂPTĂMINA were placed alongside Eugen Barbu. I think these configurations are tendentious prefabrications and accepting them is an incentive for dissension. The habit of dividing Romanian literature into separate and antagonistic camps no longer has any meaning today.

[Question] But did it have meaning at some time?

[Answer] In the age in which we had to part with the past, establishing this kind of view was possible and even considered necessary. The coexistence of Gherea and Maiorescu was not possible then, just as the coexistence of Ibraileanu and Lovinescu was not either. To conceive of the glory of one writer by obligatorily eliminating another one produces bad effects. That same mentality presided recently in Calinescu's denigration in favor of Lovinescu. The mechanism, a Manicheic one, is the same and its saviors--old or new--merely have changed the elements of the demonstration. Dividing literary history into military encampments unfortunately also has extended to modern literature. Literature is animated by contrary tensions. Marin Preda was opposed by the stubbornness of Eugen Barbu, although artistically they are not compatible structures. For a long time the development of the poets Nichita Stănescu and Ion Gheorghe was viewed also as an antagonistic pair. It is easy to see what results from this. The exclusivism of this mentality produces a literary climate accordingly.

[Question] Can you also give other examples of exclusivism in literary criticism?

[Answer] Follow a portion of the 1980 literary balances. Several names consistently are missing as if these writers did not exist and never existed, as if they never wrote anything. We reach the paradoxical situation of meeting in the readers, as a novelist told me, better defined pictures of certain very often read writers, about whom the critics are as quiet as a mouse or they get into a violent conflict with the readers' taste. In one of these recent books, "Dragostea și Revoluția" by Dinu Săraru, there is a portrait of a party activist ill with a special Bovarism, of the aristocratic pose, Anghel Tocsobie, an artist in the science of being on presidiums.

[Question] Why are you citing this character?

[Answer] I am citing this character because both criticism as well as Anghel Tocsobie are obsessed by models, animated by aesthetic Bovarism and they forget to truly contemplate the live being, the concrete existence of literature. No matter how odd it seems, despite the professions of faith being made, a portion of our literary criticism is incredibly normative. What does not enter into one critic's notebook either is being neglected, ignored on purpose or rejected. Do you not

think it is important that the taste has been lost for following literary phenomena in their entirety for great distances and that literary criticism today very many times is reduced to a simple commentary on books, without the perspective of the contexts which are required? Read in themselves, these texts may be--and some are--intelligent, even brilliant. But placed end to end, they do not always show that critical awareness which is able to see the literary phenomenon in its complex flow, past and present. The system of small and large autonomies is very bad for the critical act. First, because literature is made independent of life. Then, because within this broad independence, others are created. Within a literature the types and kinds are analyzed independently and in the limits of one author's creation merely one book is brought out from all of them. The loss of relationship with the context or contexts is clear. Admirably, G. Calinescu stated that he did not read books but writers (that is, all their works) and that he did not read writers but literature (that is, national literatures in their entirety). Stated another way, the critic allows himself to be "reformulated" by the literature with which he comes in contact.

[Question] Is not protochronism, about which you also organized a discussion, one of these norms?

[Answer] Protochronism does not set standards for anything; on the contrary, it requests the abolishing of standards which see any literature in an excessive dependence of creativity on others and a value subordination to them. As Edgar Papu following in Tudor Vlanu's footsteps understands it, protochronism requires the utilization of the neglected value dowry of any literature. It does not proceed from the obligatory priority of a certain culture, the obsession of the synchronists, but from what Blaga called "the equalness of cultures." In short, another perspective is being proposed for Romanian literature, with the emphasis on the independence of the creative act. This perspective also has changed before the eyes of the enemies of the idea of protochronism and the most eloquent fact is the emphasis on a modern literary era without the complex of synchronization back in the 17th-18th centuries by a team of "oldtimers," among which we cite Virgil Candea, Dan Zamfirescu, Zoe Dumitrescu-Busulenga, Al. Dutu, Dan Horia Mazila, about whose merits too little still is being said. According to some linguists, the appearance of the Romanian literary language is even older than the 19th century, but these radical reviews are reached by investigations which refuse preconceived ideas and methodological exclusivisms out of principle.

[Question] But does not a "dismissal," an exclusivism operate here, too? Has not synchronism been rejected in favor of protochronism? Was not E. Lovinescu a victim of the discussion about protochronism and synchronism?

[Answer] The fatal alternative between "protochronism or synchronism" does not belong to those who have debated the two concepts but is a Manicheic projection produced by Manicheic minds. If someone is a Daltonist, the ones around him are not guilty because of this. Protochronism can coexist very well with synchronism, which has been shown in a broad sense by the participants in the debate mentioned. Just as, by taking on the idea of synchronism, it is not required for us to understand it as expressed by E. Lovinescu. Minus the term, it had been set forth earlier by Gherea--unsystematically, it is true--but outlined precisely enough. Everything is disputable, starting with paternity. It is then too easily forgotten that the greatest intellects of the age disputed, refused or criticized the way in which E. Lovinescu had formulated synchronism. Today, any type of criticism of this theory is felt to be a sacrilege. Even when it is being made from Marxist positions.

[Question] It is possible that this kind of criticism could be understood as a cloud on E. Lovinescu's merits.

[Answer] E. Lovinescu's merits are historic and nobody can take them away. But to take on his theory of synchronism and his view regarding the formation of modern Romania without any reservation is not a wise act in the first place. Meanwhile diverse works of history, the history of culture, literature, sociology, philosophy have appeared, which change the data of the problems attacked by E. Lovinescu. It is good for us to take them into account. To paralyze the analysis of E. Lovinescu's opinions from a Marxist angle, as some have attempted to do, for the reason that we are returning to moments already completed--read here the proletcult period--is just like an invitation backwards, to an outdated stage of problems.

[Question] So I understand that we would have to cope with all kinds of nostalgias: nostalgia for the monopoly of opinions, nostalgia for critical and ideological Lovinescu. Are there any others?

[Answer] The nostalgia for "Minerii din Maramures" (The Miners of Maramures). A magazine published the proposal to reintroduce in school this poem which was worthy during its time. In some cases the nostalgia takes on more subtle forms, some times, it is more crude.

[Question] But is it not normal for these products, the natural product of a literary point, the expression of a political following, to be forgotten?

[Answer] I am in complete agreement. But I believe that they should stay in their place, not in manuals which generally offer models, but in the retrospective publications of those concerned. Unfortunately, their authors are the first ones to weed out their collections of these texts, viewed as sins and hidden as a result. Seasonal publications have been proliferated; they follow the fads and adjust the literary past of the person republished according to the fad today. Reporting from earlier times, the great poems, innumerable occasional poems will be looked for in vain in the new editions of some of the modern authors. The interest in manufacturing new faces is preponderant. From here we have our conclusion that these authors do not like their old selves.

[Question] You spoke of standards, however I still have not seen a Boileau of our times. But the magazine pages abound with professions of faith which assert that the act of criticism is governed merely by the judgment of artistic value. Are you not being contradicted by the facts?

[Answer] An example: Our literary criticism has taken action to stimulate a literature of social-political courage. This is the theoretical desirable. But do you not think it unnatural that in a criticism agitated at some time by the idea of "the total truth" and social-political courage the discussion of the socio-political texture of the books itself lacks courage? No matter how big the phobia of excessive and simplifying ideologizing criticism of the 50's is, not to discuss critically the content or ideology of a novel seems to me to be a case of inadequacy. Ion Lancranjan's literature, in which politics occupies the central place, must support a true aesthetizing reprimand. This is eloquent, is it not? Refuge in seeking modalities, construction, writing, in the study of signs means just as much desertion from achieving a complete critical act and with disideologizing effects.

[Question] Somehow has the novel of the "decade of obsession" lived its life?

[Answer] Any book with real qualities, coupled with success, causes imitation sometimes brought up to epigonism. The novel of the "decade of obsession" consumed a formula but not also the substance which was at its disposal. The ideal is for these books to be in competition with the realities of those years and not with other books about those years. By leaving the formula with subject and roles fixed--and leaving the fad--and returning to the reality, this level will be re-vitalized.

[Question] In the interview Dinu Sararu recently gave us in FLACARA, he led us to understand that the postwar era should be viewed as a monolithic process, without the blinders of the petit bourgeoisie.

[Answer] To use the formula of the "decade of obsession" does not mean to be a petit bourgeois. Even Dinu Sararu speaks of the authentic tragedies of the period. A decade of obsession did exist. Its errors were criticized in party documents. Up to 1964-1965 the socialist revolution saw a qualitative stage which differed from the next one. We cannot make the last 15 years of the revolution equal to the ones prior to them. It would be as if we were confusing the 5th party congress with the 9th congress. To discuss the view of the novels inspired by the "decade of obsession" is something else, with this sometimes not lacking a minor stake, a narrowness of view, a prescription, a fad, a fastidious calculation. I propose adequate exactingness against false demands.

[Question] What do you mean by "false demands?" What do they consist of?

[Answer] Of an unnatural tension in the direction of absolute exactingness, applied, however, very unilaterally and in an earthly way. Prejudices are still operating. Certain subjects, certain literary types, certain literary desirables still are being condemned. As I was saying, is this not a typical demonstration of an involuntary standardizing spirit? Don't you think it curious that some people demonstrate an undissociated resistance to patriotic poetry, to political poetry, to literature with rural themes, to historical subjects? Don't you think the fervor with which the books with these orientations sometimes are combatted is too sullen? Don't you find it is with too little consistency that solutions are sought, that colloquiums are established in order to repudiate this literature? Don't you think that this attitude lacks precisely the detached contemplation of the literary act in its natural development? Particularly since the bad example obstinately is being sought just here and never, or very rarely, in other directions. Of course, you have asked for examples. Here are several. Alexandru was considered a great poet up to and including "Vamile Pustiei." Once he wrote "Imnele Moldovei" (Hymn to Moldavia) and "Imnele Transilvaniei" (Hymn to Transylvania), the poet was dethroned without hesitation. I do not see here some inevitable objections, just as in any other case, but a turnaround of 180°. Edgar Papu is a fine and erudite comparative writer when he shows the Germans' protochronism and, suddenly, he becomes a ridiculous individual when he tries to show protochronism for Romanian literature ("From Our Classics"). Don't you think it eloquent that nothing is written about Adrian Paunescu's poetry, which was violently attacked at the Iasi Poetry Colloquium, according to its value and importance, not even with the occasion of a book like "Manifest Pentru Sanata-tea Pamintului" (Manifesto for a Healthy Earth)? Idiosyncrasies still operate against the clarity of statements which mimic the calm reception of values.

[Question] I think what you are saying is convincing. But what conclusions can be drawn from this?

[Answer] That the elitism fought by Ibraileanu formerly against making its appearance dressed as aestheticizing purisms. Literary elitism prefers less earthly subjects, less crude subjects; isn't it so that it detests "pasture writing" and, of course, does not agree with a direction such as that of the former VIATA ROMANESTI, whose slogan was the duty toward the people. Elitist symptoms or features are enough. The theory of the comfortable, lazy, stupid and imbecilic reader incapable of deciphering the subtleties of modern literature has been made insistently in Romania. It expresses an elitist tendency, an attempt at making the reader feel guilty. This same tendency also is illustrated by the perseverant cut of some writings which have no reader audience, generally unreadable, but faithful to an elitist model. We also can discover an elitist vector in the excessive reliance placed by some people on the specialization of the critical act and on the use of ostentatious terminology which is inaccessible to the layman. The recent attacks on G. Calinescu also have come from this area. I do not wish to describe a system, but rather to indicate several aspects of it. Total "voievod-phobia" as a sign of disinterest in the past also is an elitist plume. They also are seen in the attitude toward historical literature. The cycle "Zapezile de Acum un Veac" (The Snows of a Century Ago) by Paul Anghel, for example, did not find criticism prepared for such a construction.

[Question] Give me a case of a reception lacking the calm of value.

[Answer] The idiosyncrasy for Eugen Barbu, for example, is an old one and begins with "Groapa" (The Hole). The romanticism of the periphery was felt to be suspect. Whoever writes the literary history of this period will be struck by the effort of literary criticism of the time to keep Eugen Barbu in a kind of literary quarantine. The reaction also is observed in other books written by Barbu. The critical apodictism of the time, the quintessence of which is the literary magazine, exercised a strict control over the literary glories. It built by eliminating, regardless of the clear value of one writer or another. It was just one step from here to the creation of a Barbu case. Which also was done, with the unreserved contribution of Eugen Barbu. The history of the postwar literary exclusivism cannot be written by avoiding the idiosyncrasy with Eugen Barbu, and neither can the sometimes unjust pamphlet tirades of the latter.

[Question] Why are you dwelling on Eugen Barbu's literature?

[Answer] Please remember that the dwelling on the name, person and literature of Eugen Barbu does not belong only to me. You will find it in plentiful supply in others. But I do not think we should be like the ostrich who wants to pretend he does not know what is going on. Not to talk about all this means to be an accomplice to an expelling trend.

[Question] More specifically?

[Answer] Eugen Barbu is a writer of indisputable value. His case illustrates the extraliterary stake of some recent discussions. The proof? Following them, Eugen Barbu disappeared from the manual for modern Romanian literary history for the 12th grade. In its place appeared Alexandru Ivasiuc. The rule according to which one writer is lowered in order to have another one rise in his place is illustrated here perfectly. Other commentaries are unnecessary.

[Question] Perhaps the readers will be surprised to find that M. Ungheanu, the author of a book on Marin Preda, speaks like this about a writer who often attacked Marin Preda.

[Answer] Literary rivalries should not become civil wars through taking one side or another. Especially since the artistic structure of the two writers, which differs so much, is a good of modern Romanian literature, from which they cannot part. For me, Marin Preda's position does not mean an anti-Barbu position, even if the late great writer himself understood it in this way. Regretfully I must say that the rivalry between the two writers was kept up by the clientele guards surrounding each of them. However, I do know that Marin Preda reviewed Eugen Barbu's writing in all seriousness and that he had an artist's dissatisfaction when it seemed to him that the novelist Barbu was not respecting the condition: "He has all the data of a Celine of the Romanians," Preda said about Barbu. "He has a vocation for black view as nobody ever had in Romanian literature. Why does he rely only on this?"

[Question] If I were to tell you there is a lessening of critical responses to Marin Preda's works, would I be giving a mistaken opinion?

[Answer] Not exactly. This also happened following the death of the imposing president of the Union of Writers, Zaharia Stancu. Marin Preda's job--director of "Romanian Books" and vice president of the Union of Writers--activated many pens during his lifetime. A relative quiet followed the choir of superlatives for "Cel Mai Iubit Dintre Paminteni". But Marin Preda's works will demand their rights in time. And they will do themselves justice.

[Question] But by discussing Marin Preda or Eugen Barbu so much, are we not taking a risk in restricting presentation of our literature today?

[Answer] The horizon for modern Romanian literature is so rich and complex that it cannot be exhausted in one interview. I have all faith in the representatives of the new generation of writers who are beginning to assume with all responsibility the major problems of Romanian literature as if they are of their own awareness. It is the only way by which the newcomers to literature can free themselves from the uproar over literary battles with false stakes. They are starting to understand that they are not living through dispensation and that the great works do not have to be written only by the older ones. Many times, the veterans have disappointed us through the absence of an integrating literary awareness. (I am leaving aside these veterans' predilection for seasonal editions, from which the old incidental texts have been eliminated.) The groans that the great generation is gone and that, oh dear, Romanian literature is a wasteland have no meaning. To intoxicate the young generation with these ideas means to demobilize it. When our very talented young novelists understand that each one of them is dutybound to write a great novel for Romanian literature, regardless of what his predecessors did, their indisputable science of writing will take on high moral and artistic justification.

[Question] There are voices claiming that you exercise authoritarian control over the critical texts appearing in LUCEAFARUL. This would be in conformity with some orders which steal the capability for initiative from the particular critics.

[Answer] From what I know, since the complaint has not come from V. F. Mihaescu, Dan Alexandru Condeescu, Paul Dugneanu, Artur Silvestri, Dan C. Mihailescu, the matter is classified from itself. It is true that I made the mistake of not letting them exercise their warlike spirit on E. Simion, N. Manolescu and M. Iorgulescu. After the persons mentioned gave their opinions, I eliminated this single interdiction.

[Question] But what is Mihai Ungheanu writing?

[Answer] I am writing what you see in LUCEAFARUL and I have prepared for publication a volume of interviews and one of studies.

[Question] Other plans?

[Answer] I announced in another interview, compelled by my interviewer, a book entitled "Biblioteca Proiectelor Esuate" (The Library of Failed Plans) which proposes to talk of the wrecks of some great plans from Romanian literature, that is, the dramatic condition of this literature.

[Question] What you are telling me sounds much too interesting not to ask you for details.

[Answer] An article of this title, prudently changed by my former editor-in-chief Nicolae Dragos, entitled "The Library of Unfulfilled Plans," was published in LUCEAFARUL. The person who illustrates one of the cases in "Library" is Nicolae Balcescu. It is captivating to follow Romanian literature in its draft phase. A development by burning stages, as our literature had, sacrificed very many plans which, analyzed, make up the genuine appearance of this literature. There is not one important Romanian writer who does not have an unfinished plan in his drawer. Titu Maiorescu wanted to write a history of the Romanians. Rebreanu planned a novel entitled "Pacala si Tindala" in a heroic-comic style. I think we can remain with his nostalgia. Pavel Dan was getting documents for a novel which remains unwritten. The plans of the promising Alexandru Sahia are in the same situation. Marin Preda planned a book on Vlad Tepes, suggested by Iorga's "History of the Romanians." An as yet unexplored universe but one which, reestablished, would speak with unexpected eloquency about the hidden aspiration of Romanian literature.

[Question] Finally, what can you tell us about literary life and its public organs?

[Answer] I feel that having Comrade Nicolae Ceausescu promote a broad dialogue of the party leadership with the writers is a sign of real democratization. A real democratization also is needed in the life of the Union of Writers. The associations and sections are completely inactive, stripped of their duties. But a paragraph exists in the union's statutes which excludes the majority of members from the life of the community. Which is not natural.

[Question] How do you think Romanian literary and cultural realities are reflected in other countries?

[Answer] The circulation of Romanian books in the world is a continually new problem, although an old one. However, I do not think it is recommended for them--the books--to advance by becoming subordinate to western recipes. But by that plus of personality and propaganda support which, in this case, is indispensable. Much is being done here regarding the picture of our literature and our culture, as it is projected outside the country, but more still has to be done. Among other things, I think a decisive public rebuff is needed of the denigrating campaign conducted from outside the country against some writers and some of our books. A rebuff not only from some isolated writers but, in particular, from the leadership of the Union of Writers. This is their duty of honor.

END OF

FICHE

DATE FILMED

6/5/81
